



CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

*Emperor and Senators
in the Reign of
Constantius II*

*Maintaining Imperial Rule Between
Rome and Constantinople in the Fourth Century AD*

MURIEL MOSER

EMPEROR AND SENATORS IN THE REIGN OF CONSTANTIUS II

In this book, Muriel Moser investigates the relationship between the emperors Constantine I and his son Constantius II (AD 312–361) and the senators of Constantinople and Rome. She examines and contextualizes the integration of the social elites of Rome and the eastern provinces into the imperial system and demonstrates their increased importance for the maintenance of imperial rule in response to political fragility and fragmentation. An in-depth analysis of senatorial careers and imperial legislation is combined with a detailed assessment of the political context – shared rule, the suppression of usurpations, Constantius’ use of Constantine’s memory. Using a wide range of literary, epigraphic, numismatic and legal sources, some of which are as yet unpublished, this volume produces significant new readings of the history of the senates in Rome and Constantinople, of the construction of imperial rule and of historical change in late antiquity.

MURIEL MOSER is Assistant Professor of Ancient History at Goethe-Universität Frankfurt. Her research focuses on the political and cultural history of the Graeco-Roman world from 100 BC to AD 400. Her publications include a themed volume of *Antiquité Tardive* called *Imperial Presence in Late Antique Rome (2nd–7th Centuries AD)* (co-edited with M. McEvoy, 2017), as well as *Strategies of Remembering in Greece under Rome (100 BC–100 AD)* (co-edited with T. M. Dijkstra, I. N. I. Kuin and D. Weidgenannt, 2017).

CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

General editors

R. G. OSBORNE, W. M. BEARD, G. BETEGH,
J. P. T. CLACKSON, R. L. HUNTER, M. J. MILLETT,
S. P. OAKLEY, T. J. G. WHITMARSH

**EMPEROR AND SENATORS IN THE REIGN
OF CONSTANTIUS II**

Maintaining Imperial Rule Between Rome and
Constantinople in the Fourth Century AD

MURIEL MOSER

Goethe-Universität Frankfurt Am Main



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108481014

DOI: [10.1017/9781108646086](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108646086)

© Muriel Moser 2018

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2018

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Clays Ltd, Elcograf S.p.A

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Moser, Muriel, author.

Title: Emperor and senators in the reign of Constantius II : maintaining imperial rule between Rome and Constantinople in the fourth century AD / Muriel Moser, Goethe-Universität at Frankfurt Am Main.

Other titles: *Senatui auctoritatem pristinam reddidisti*

Description: New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. | Series: [Cambridge classical studies] | Revision and extension of the author's thesis (Ph.D.–University of Cambridge, 2013) under the title: *Senatvi auctoritatem pristinam reddidisti: the Roman senatorial aristocracy under Constantine and Constantius II.*

Identifiers: LCCN 2018039110 | ISBN 9781108481014 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108703710 (paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Rome – History – Constantius II, 337–361. | Constantius II, Emperor of Rome, 317–361. | Rome. Senate. | Nobility – Rome. | Rome – History – Constantine I, the Great, 306–337.

Classification: LCC DG316.3 M68 2019 | DDC 937/.08–dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2018039110>

ISBN 978-1-108-48101-4 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

<i>List of Figures</i>	page ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xv
Introduction	I
Part I A Unified Roman Empire (AD 312–337)	
1 Constantine and the Senate of Rome	13
2 Constantine’s Eastern Roman Empire	45
Part II Ruling the East (AD 337–350)	
3 The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II	85
4 Remembering Constantine in Antioch and Constantinople	119
Part III Ruler of Rome and Constantinople (AD 350–361)	
5 Crisis and Innovation: Between Magnentius and Gallus	171
6 Romanizing Constantinople: The Creation of a Second Senate	214
7 A Roman Triumph: Constantius II in Rome	277
Conclusion	313

Contents

<i>Appendices</i>	333
<i>Bibliography</i>	361
<i>Index</i>	407

FIGURES

- 1.1 Gold medallion minted in Rome, obverse depicting Constantine I looking upwards, reverse a toga-clad figure with the legend *SENATVS* (*RIC* VII Rome 272). page 17
- 2.1 Gold medallion, obverse depicting Constantine with a laureate crown, reverse a Roman knight with the legend *EQVIS ROMANVS* (*RIC* VII Nicomedia 100). 51
- 2.2 Solidus minted in Nicomedia, obverse showing Constantine with a diadem, reverse a toga-clad figure with the legend *SENATVS* (*RIC* VII Nicomedia 102). 52
- 4.1 Solidus, obverse depicting Constantius II with a diadem, reverse showing the enthroned representations of Rome and Constantinople (Roma and Constantinopolis) with the legend *GLORIA REI PVBLICAE* (*RIC* VIII Antiochia 83). 120
- 4.2 Solidus, obverse depicting a veiled bust of Constantine I with the legend *DIVVS CONSTANTINVS AVG(ustus) PATER AVGG(ustorum)*, reverse showing a toga-clad figure in a four-horsed chariot driving towards the sky, from where a divine hand reaches down to the driver (*RIC* VIII Constantinople I). 149
- 4.3 Bronze coin, obverse showing a veiled bust of Constantine I, reverse a veiled, toga-clad figure

Figures

- with the legend *V(e)N(eranda) M(emo)R(ia)*
(*RIC* VIII Nicomedia 48). 159
- 4.4 Silver coin (siliqua), obverse depicting a diademed
Constantius II in 'Alexandresque' portrait (*RIC*
VIII Antioch 35). 161

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book began as a PhD thesis at the University of Cambridge. It would never have seen the light of day without the support and encouragement of many people.

My PhD supervisor Christopher Kelly has been a source of encouragement, inspiration and constructive suggestions since I came up to Cambridge to study Classics for a BA degree at Corpus Christi College. I consider myself very privileged to have had you as my teacher and mentor in Cambridge. I thank you above all for your unrivalled ability to motivate by transforming hard work into a thoroughly rewarding and fun experience.

I am also very grateful to the editors of Cambridge Classical Series for accepting to publish my revised thesis in their series, not least because of their helpful and diligent feedback on my manuscript, from which it has greatly profited. This book owes much to the academic traditions of the Faculty of Classics of the University of Cambridge and to its inspiring academic community and its committed teachers. With the inclusion of this monograph in its series, I feel this project has come full circle, from my first undergraduate essay in Ancient History to a monograph in its series.

I want to seize this opportunity to warmly thank my two PhD examiners, Caroline Humfress and Peter Sarris, for a very enjoyable viva and for their constructive suggestions, as well as Jill Harries, whose comments on my thesis have helped me to sharpen my questions and strengthen my argument. I am moreover very grateful to Caillan Davenport, Denis Feissel, Julian Hillner, Hartmut Leppin, Johannes Wienand and Michael Williams for their learned feedback on earlier versions of this

Acknowledgements

book. Thanks go also to the three anonymous reviewers of *JRS* for comments on some pages of this book that were submitted to the journal for publication as an article.

Many more scholars have contributed to this project with their insightful comments, their time and their encouraging suggestions. The project took shape under the care and wise guidance of Peter Garnsey, my MPhil mentor, Charlotte Roueché and Rebecca Flemming. I was fortunate to be able to discuss specialist questions with a number of erudite colleagues. I warmly thank Denis Feissel for his learned thoughts and his kind counsel on Philippus' inscriptions during a number of always very pleasant meetings in Paris and Rome. I have learned a lot from our discussions, and am very grateful in particular for the kind permission to publish a crucial passage of a yet unpublished inscription from Perge in this monograph. Moreover, I want to express my warmest gratitude to Simon Corcoran and Benet Salway, for their useful advice on careers, codes and Constantine, and for our delightful lunches at UCL.

I would furthermore like to thank the organizers and participants of various British Epigraphy Society events and of the Cambridge Epigraphic Saturdays for their comments on several inscriptions discussed in this book. Thanks go also to Caillan Davenport, Sylvain Destephen, Marie Roux, Meaghan McEvoy, Benet Salway, Michele Salzman and Alexander Skinner for sharing unpublished work with me.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge at this juncture my PhD funding body, the Faculty of Classics in Cambridge, and to thank Walter Ameling and the Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach-Stiftung for a scholarship in Cologne. In addition, I want to express my gratitude to the École Normale Supérieure and to Mireille Corbier of the Année Épigraphique for the opportunity to spend a wonderful term in Paris.

Several more friends and colleagues have contributed to this book in various (not always strictly academic) ways: Valérie and Maxime Bilhaud, Eveline Bouwers, Annette Eska, Barrie Fleet, Philip Forness, Elisabeth and Jean-Daniel Gerber,

Acknowledgements

Maria Kilby, Meaghan McEvoy, Alberto Dalla Rosa, Samuel Schalck and Robin Whelan.

Turning a thesis into a book is a laborious enterprise. This book was written while I was a Wissenschaftliche Assistentin at the Goethe-Universität Frankfurt. In this process, I have profited greatly from the institution's facilities, not least from its well-stocked library, as well as from several *Dienstreisen* to Paris and its excellent Bibliothèque Gernet-Glotz. Furthermore, I was fortunate to be able to draw on Tomas Schauer and Kilian Schütz and their help with proof-reading and reference checking. My text has profited also from Orla Mulholland and her language editing skills. Finally, Michael Sharp and his team at CUP have been extremely helpful and supportive. Many thanks for seeing this monograph into print!

Der größte Dank aber gebührt meiner Familie – meinen Eltern, die dieses Projekt bereits unterstützt haben, als es noch nicht existierte, meiner Schwester Carolyn, von deren Klugheit und Rat es wiederholt profitiert hat, und meinem lieben Ehemann Mathias, dessen Liebe und Freundschaft es zu einem von vielen schönen Projekten gemacht haben. Nun kann ich Euch von diesem Buch endlich berichten: Es ist fertig! Dass dem so ist liegt nicht zuletzt an Eurer Unterstützung und Eurem Zuspruch. Euch widme ich dieses Buch, in Dankbarkeit und Liebe.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AAAH</i>	<i>Acta ad archaeologiam et atrium historiam pertinentia</i>
<i>ABSA</i>	<i>The Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
<i>AE</i>	<i>L'Année épigraphique</i> (1888–)
<i>AECR</i>	<i>Association pour l'Étude de la Civilisation Romaine</i>
<i>AJAH</i>	<i>American Journal of Ancient History</i>
<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AncSoc</i>	<i>Ancient Society</i>
<i>AntTard</i>	<i>Antiquité Tardive</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i>
<i>ByzZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>CCEC</i>	<i>Cahiers du Centre d'Études Chypriotes</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Codex Justinianus</i>
<i>CLRE</i>	R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz and K. A. Worp (1987) <i>Consuls of the Later Roman Empire</i> , Atlanta, GA, American Philological Association.
<i>CNRS</i>	<i>Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique</i>
<i>CPh</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CTh</i>	<i>Theodosian Code</i>
<i>DOP</i>	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
<i>HSCPh</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>ILS</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i>
<i>JLA</i>	<i>Journal of Late Antiquity</i>
<i>JNG</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte</i>

Abbreviations

<i>JÖAI</i>	<i>Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
<i>JRA</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>LSA</i>	<i>Last Statues of Antiquity</i>
<i>MEFRA</i>	<i>Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité</i>
<i>MH</i>	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
<i>PCBE</i>	J. Desmulliez et al. (eds) (1999–2000) <i>Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas Empire, 2, Prosopographie de l'Italie Chrétienne</i> , Paris, CNRS
<i>PIR²</i>	<i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani</i>
<i>PLRE I</i>	A. H. M. Jones, G. R. Martindale and J. Morris (eds) (1971) <i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, 1, A.D. 260–395</i> , Cambridge University Press.
<i>PLRE II</i>	A. H. M. Jones, G. R. Martindale and J. Morris (eds) (1980) <i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, 2, A.D. 395–527</i> , Cambridge University Press.
Project Volterra	The LAWS Database of the Project Volterra, based at University College London. Online database of late Roman laws, with English translations (revisions of C. Pharr's Theodosian Code, Princeton, 1952) for the laws from AD 337 to 361: www.ucl.ac.uk/volterra/database .
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antikes und Christentum</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des Études Anciennes</i>
<i>RIC VII</i>	H. V. Sutherland and R. A. G. Carson (eds) (1966) <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage</i> , vol. 7 by M. Bruun, <i>Constantine and Licinius, A.D. 313–337</i> , London, Spink.
<i>RIC VIII</i>	H. V. Sutherland and R. A. G. Carson (eds) (1966) <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage</i> , vol. 8 by

Abbreviations

- M. Bruun, *The Family of Constantine I, A.D. 337–364*, London, Spink.
- RM* *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*
- SC* *Sources Chrétiennes*
- SDHI* *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris*
- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (1923–), Amsterdam, Gieben.
- SIG* W. Dittenberger (ed.) (1915–24)
Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum,
Hildesheim, Olms.
- TTH* *Translated Texts for Historians* (Liverpool University Press)
- ZPE* *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

INTRODUCTION

In late 324 the emperor Constantine celebrated his final victory over Licinius, and his consequent rise to sole power, by founding a new city which he named after himself, Constantinople.¹ He now needed to win acceptance among the eastern population whose emperor he had just defeated. The engagement of the provincial elite with the imperial regime was a crucial component in maintaining imperial rule, and was traditionally facilitated by grants of privileges, high rank and honours.² In the case of Constantine, the question of how elites were drawn into the imperial regime is particularly interesting. It happened at the same time as an increasingly widespread conferment of senatorial rank on the political elites at court and in the administration, a process that had the potential to reconfigure the relationship between elites and emperors. Constantine's policies in the East were as a consequence part of this larger process of reconfiguration, and raise the question of how the increased integration of the eastern elites aligned with imperial relations with the senate in Rome and its senatorial elites.

Constantine's relationship with the senatorial aristocracy has received much attention in scholarship. Moving away from the conflict paradigm, which postulated a conflict over religion or culture between an increasingly Christianized court and the pagan elites in Rome, the focus of research has shifted to the question of the continuous absence of the emperor from Rome, and whether this should be seen as evidence of increasing imperial neglect of the old capital and the marginalization

¹ All dates are AD unless indicated.

² Lendon (1997).

Introduction

of its senators in the running of the empire.³ Policies such as the upgrading of several equestrian posts to senatorial rank, which made senatorial office and rank more easily available, or the reform of the *suffect* consulate, had the potential to disadvantage the traditional senatorial families in Rome to the benefit of new elites, and it could be argued that, through these imperial policies, senatorial honours became attached more closely than ever before to service to the emperor, rather than to the privileges of high birth.⁴ Constantine's reforms continued those of the Tetrarchy, but, in contrast to the Tetrarchs' expansion of the equestrian administration, under Constantine many important posts became senatorial.⁵

What impact did these policies have on imperial relations with Rome? And were Constantine's dealings with Rome affected by his eastern policies, especially the recruitment of new supporters among the eastern elite? A re-examination of Constantine's regime-building policies in the East shed new light on these questions. Based on the literary sources, scholarship has recently suggested that these policies included the

³ Weisweiler (2015a), (2012a), (2012b), (2011), and Chenault (2012), (2008). On forms and functions of imperial presence in late antique Rome, see now also McEvoy and Moser (2017) and the contributions to *AntTard* 25 it introduces.

⁴ The literature on the senatorial reforms and the senatorial order under Constantine is extensive. Here as elsewhere in my study I have chosen to refer in particular to the most recent literature, following the preference of the publishing house for lean footnotes. This does not imply any lack of appreciation for the earlier, especially French, German or Italian scholarship, with its essential contributions to our understanding of the nature of imperial rule in the fourth century. In addition to the literature already cited, recent works include Dillon (2015); Salway (2015); Lizzi Testa (2013); Skinner (2013), (2008), (2000); Machado (2012), (2010); Schmidt-Hofner (2010); Rebenich (2008), (2007); Salzman (2002); Heather (1998), (1994); Näf (1996); Schlinkert (1996); Marcone (1993); Chastagnol (1992); Kuhoff (1983), (1982); Löhken (1982); Weiss (1975); and Jones (1963). On the elites in the later Roman Empire more broadly, see the excellent introductions of Brown (2000) and Matthews (2000b).

⁵ On the equestrian reforms of Diocletian, see Davenport (2018). The emergence of the (senatorial) palatine administration is discussed in Harries (2012) 139–45; Kelly (2012) 189–90 with n. 31–9; Carrié and Rouselle (1999) 259–63; Harries (1988); Kuhoff (1983); Bonfils (1981); Clauss (1980); Boak (1924). Roux (2014); Porena (2006), (2003); Barnes (1996), (1994), (1992); Moro (1996), and Migl (1994) discuss the emergence of the praetorian prefectures. Mennen (2011); Carrié and Rouselle (1999) 655–7, and Kuhoff (1982) 273–74 offer balanced accounts of Tetrarchic 'senatorial' policies.

widespread conferment of senatorial rank,⁶ but I wish to ask whether and to what extent an eastern senatorial constituency emerged under Constantine. By studying the composition of the senatorial officials in the East, it is possible not only to revisit this issue, but also to investigate the impact of Constantine's eastern policies on the career changes of the traditional social elites, the senators in Rome, and of their role in Constantine's eastern empire. This investigation needs to begin by reassessing the role of the traditional elites in the West, the senators of Rome, in Constantine's government, in order to gauge whether the foundation of Constantinople constituted a turning point in their relationship. This study is provided in [Chapter 1](#) of this book, and it forms the political and social background for a re-examination of Constantine's charm offensive towards the elites in the East, presented in [Chapter 2](#), which pays particular attention to the possibility that this entailed an important senatorial dimension, possibly including the foundation of a first senate in Constantinople.

In this reconfiguration of the relationship between eastern elites and imperial regime, the reign of Constantius II, Constantine's son and successor, is of special interest. For the first part of his reign, from 337 to 350, Constantius shared imperial rule with his brothers as emperor of the East, so it is important to gauge the extent to which the government of the empire too may have been partitioned into separate realms in this period. There is evidence that Constantius continued to draw support from Rome to maintain his rule in the East, but it is clear that at the same time he had a strong interest in harnessing support among the eastern elites, in view of his difficult relationship with his brothers in the West. No detailed study has been made of Constantius' relationship with the eastern elites, and it remains poorly understood. To date, scholarly attention has focused on the character of his reign and of his imperial bureaucracy, which is also at the centre of ancient narratives about his rule.⁷ Chantal Vogler concluded

⁶ Heather (1994) and also (1998).

⁷ Government: Potter (2004) 476–82; Bonfils (1981); Clauss (1980); Vogler (1979); Edbrooke (1976), (1975).

Introduction

that Constantius was the ‘first Byzantine emperor’, a ruler centred on the imperial court and a new, Christian elite drawn from the eastern provinces, but this has yet to be substantiated in a prosopographical analysis of his senatorial supporters at the imperial court and in the wider provincial administration.⁸ Provincial governors represented Constantius in the provinces and wielded considerable power, and it was here that elites strove for social and political prestige and senatorial honours. The present work (in [Chapter 3](#)) offers a comprehensive list of Constantius’ senatorial officials in these posts, established on the basis of a large number of epigraphic sources, along with the information provided by Libanius and Ammianus, and on this basis the chapter analyses Constantius’ senatorial policies, as they can be inferred from the make-up of his senatorial support, in their social background, places of origin and career structures.⁹ This provides a reliable basis for investigating Constantius’ relationship with the eastern elites, while also considering the employment of Roman senators in the East. It also allows me to revisit common arguments about the transformation of the senatorial elites and the relationship between, on the one hand, the integration of the eastern elites in this period and, on the other, the role of Roman senators in imperial rule in the East.

This prosopographical analysis needs to be set in the context of the political nature of imperial rule in this period. A major obstacle is that we have no major historical narrative source for Constantius’ early reign.¹⁰ Nonetheless, there is ample evidence of the imperially driven promotion of Constantinople and its senate in this period, raising the question of what role the city

⁸ Vogler (1979) with Béranger (1981) and Petit (1981).

⁹ On the senators mentioned in Libanius, see e.g. Bradbury (2004) and Petit (1957).

¹⁰ Due to the loss of the earlier books, Ammianus’ *Res Gestae* only pick up in 353. Aurelius Victor’s *De Caesaribus* on the reign of Constantius has a similar focus. Eutropius’ *Breviarium*, too, mostly focuses on Constantius’ reign following the usurpation of Magnentius, with only some brief comments about Constantius’ military exploits against Shapur II in the earlier decade. Finally, Zosimus’ *New History* contains brief remarks about Constantius’ involvement in the dynastic murders in 337, yet his interest, too, is in the period following the usurpation of Magnentius in 350. On Christian authors on Constantius II, see Flower (2016), (2013); Humphries (1997); Leppin (1996) 60–71; Girardet (1977), (1975).

and its council played in Constantius' eastern empire.¹¹ While under Constantine imperial presence and favour were centred on Constantinople, Constantius' court resided in Antioch due to the ongoing threat on the eastern front. The impact of this shift on the relationship between the imperial centre and the eastern elites is addressed in [Chapter 4](#). Its other concern is Constantius' relationship with Constantinople. The city was a symbol of his Constantinian descent, and his attitude to his Constantinian heritage is likely to have shaped his relationship with the city. This can be studied through several panegyrics that provide crucial details about the political ideology and dynastic situation in his reign, and are highly revealing about Constantius' eastern rule in this period.¹² Besides Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*, published around 340, Libanius' *Oration* 59, written for one of Constantius' officials in 344, is of particular interest as a source of imperial ideology. Also revealing are the works of the Constantinopolitan orator Bearchius, and two works by the Athenian writer Praxagoras, viz. a *Life of Constantine* and a *Life of Alexander*. All three of these works were written in the early 340s and, even though they no longer survive, their titles reveal that the commemoration of Constantine was an important aspect of Constantius' ideology. The upgrading of Constantinople's status was highlighted by introducing the motif of the twin-city showing *Roma* and *Constantinopolis*, the Tychai of Rome and Constantinople, side by side and may also have been motivated, at least in part, by these dynastic attitudes, rather than by imperial concerns about elite engagement in the East ([Chapter 4](#)). The chapter contributes to our understanding of Constantius' public image as emperor and his dealings with his subjects.¹³

¹¹ The literary and legal sources are discussed in Skinner (2008). For the numismatic evidence see Wienand (2015); Pietri (1989); Toynbee (1947), (1945); Alföldi (1943); Seeck (1898).

¹² On imperial panegyric and Constantius II, see now e.g. Omissi (2018) and Ross (2016). On the complex nature of panegyric as product of both imperial demands and the agenda of the respective speaker in general: e.g. Rees (2012), (2002); Whitby (1998); MacCormack (1975).

¹³ On Constantius' 'popular' policies, see Henck (2007), (2002), (2001), (1998). On Constantius' imperial image, see Teitler (1992).

Introduction

If Constantius' early reign was marked by the continuous presence of Roman senators in the East, the study of the higher ranks of the eastern administration in the early 350s reveals a change in the recruitment pattern and the meteoric rise of eastern senators to high office in the East. In this period Constantius' relationship with the West was greatly affected by three usurpations, especially Magnentius' *coup d'état* in 350. It is argued in this book that this had a considerable impact on Constantius' relationship with the eastern elites, which seem to have replaced Roman senators in his administration. My proposal is that in this period Constantius was cut off from access to the senate of Rome and could no longer draw on its support to legitimize his rule, and that this greatly advanced the chances of the eastern elites to hold high administrative responsibilities in his eastern empire. An unpublished inscription suggests that Constantinople played an important role in this, serving as a hub for the emperor's new senatorial supporters in the East. A reassessment of Constantius' relationship with the eastern elites and their role in his eastern empire during the usurpation of Magnentius, presented in [Chapter 5](#), thus sheds light on an important period in the establishment of a senatorial constituency in the East and in the promotion of Constantinople.

The integration of the eastern elites into the imperial regime in the East was completed when in the late 350s a fully fledged senate emerged in the East and large numbers of new senators were recruited for the institution. The most detailed discussion of the history of Constantinople to date is Gilbert Dagron's 1974 monograph *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*. Dagron's study is highly insightful, but has little discussion of the period between 337 and 355, and his interest is primarily in the history of Constantinople as a city, so he has less to offer on the political context in which a second senate emerged in Constantinople, or on its relationship with Rome. Recent scholarship has reinvestigated the origins of the members of Constantinople's senate, concluding that the overwhelming majority came from the wealthiest traditional

provincial elites in the East, in a social hierarchy that imitated that of the Roman senate in the West.¹⁴ Our understanding of the profile of this membership is greatly improved by reassessing the institutional character of the senate, and the rules by which membership in it was acquired. I re-examine these issues in [Chapter 6](#), and show that the question can be greatly advanced also by a more detailed study of the inter-relationship between the enlargement of the senatorial order, on the one hand, and the expansion of the senatorial administration that occurred in this period, on the other, and also by investigating the new senate's relationship with Rome, which was shaped not least by the transfer of senators to it from Rome.

In turn, there is also a need to re-evaluate Constantius' relationship with Rome in this later period. Consequently [Chapter 7](#) revisits claims that Constantius' relationship with Rome was problematic due to an imperial policy against sacrifice and pagan traditions more generally. A detailed discussion of relevant inscriptions from Rome, laws and contemporary material culture, including the *Codex Calendar* of 354, a senatorial calendar of the public festivals of Rome, alongside the study of Constantius' senatorial appointment policies in the West, offers a basis from which to tackle these conventional arguments that Constantius' relationship with Rome was difficult because of his promotion of Christianity or of Constantinople. Of particular importance here is Constantius' return visit to Rome in 357, when the emperor was acclaimed 'Emperor of Rome and Father of the Senate', and Rome was celebrated as centre of the Roman world. A better understanding of the political context of Constantius' relation with Rome and in particular of this visit helps us understand the reshaping of imperial relations with the elites in the West during the promotion of a fully fledged senate in the East, and is thus an important complementary study to the analysis of the promotion of Constantinople.

¹⁴ The classic study is Heather (1994), and (1998), see also Boulay (2016); Moser (2016b); Skinner (2013), (2008), (2000); Harper (2008), Hermann-Otto (2007) 151–2. For older discussions, see Tinnefeld (1977) 61–2, 176–7 and Petit (1957).

Introduction

The careers of the senatorial elites under Constantine and Constantius between 337 and 361 have not yet been discussed in detail. New findings challenge accepted reconstructions of several senatorial careers in this period, as they have been established in *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I*, published by A. H. M. Jones, John Martindale and John Morris in 1971. A revised study of the social background and careers of these officials creates a reliable basis for investigating Constantius' relationship with the senatorial elites of Rome and Constantinople. My aim is to investigate the political role of the eastern elites in the survival of imperial rule in the East, rather than to assess the character of the reigns of the emperors concerned. Consequently I do not assess the cultural change that this implied, or the degree of criticism it earned within the eastern elites, though my study offers a basis for further investigating these issues in the future.¹⁵ Rather, my aim is a comprehensive re-examination of how the eastern elites were engaged in imperial government, in its full political, ideological and social context. I will not be much concerned with the question of the role of Christianity in this context. Scholars have tried to investigate whether Christian emperors preferred to work with Christianized elites and, if so, how far this impacted on the career successes of the old (pagan) elites in Rome.¹⁶ However, religious affiliation is difficult to determine from career success alone,¹⁷ and in any case the success of pagan elites suggests that, while affiliation to Christianity may have helped some individuals in their quest for high office, it was not a prerequisite for appointment.¹⁸ Overall, the attempt to assess the role of Christianity has tended to obscure the political necessity of imperial collaboration with the traditional

¹⁵ This important question is addressed in Skinner (2000) and Dagron (1984), (1968).

¹⁶ The classic study is Alföldi (1948). See also Iara (2015); Barnes (2011), (1995), (1989a), and also Salzman (2002); Bonfils (1981); Novak (1979); von Haehling (1978); Edbrooke (1975); Chastagnol (1976), (1968b), (1960).

¹⁷ Cameron (2011) 178–9 and Bardill (2012) 302–3.

¹⁸ Von Haehling (1978); Salzman (2016); Marcone (1993); and more generally Watts (2015).

Introduction

elites as a means of achieving political stability in a period of continuing fragmentation of imperial rule.

The investigation of how the eastern elites engaged with the imperial regimes after Constantine's defeat of Licinius also allows us to refine the chronology of the creation of a second senate in Constantinople. There are very few sources on the nature of the institution at the time of Constantine's foundation of the city, and its function and relation to the Roman senate are still insufficiently understood. The scholarly consensus ascribes the foundation of this body to Constantine, as is neatly summarized by Lucy Grig and Gavin Kelly: 'it seems to be clear that Constantine created the senate, a *synedrion* rather than a *boule*, even if founded on a smaller scale than Rome's and with a secondary status'.¹⁹ We are likewise poorly informed about the situation of the institution in the joint reign of the brother emperors Constantine II, Constans and Constantius between 337 and 350. One open question is whether this senate was identical to the urban council of Constantinople or a separate institution.²⁰ Nor is it clear when this initial senate developed into a fully fledged equivalent of the one in Rome. The dominant view is that the senate of Constantinople functioned as a full equivalent of Rome only from the late 350s onwards, following the separation of the senatorial order on geographical lines in 357, or the introduction of an urban prefect in 359. However, it has recently been proposed that the upgrading occurred around 340, following the introduction of a proconsul to the city.²¹ My reinvestigation of the career structures of senators in the East in this period sheds new light on these questions and in particular on the period between 337 and 355, which is rarely considered in this context.

All in all, the goal of my discussion is to locate the increased engagement of the eastern elites in the imperial structure in the context of the continuing fragility of imperial power in the

¹⁹ Quotation from Grig and Kelly (2012) 12, with references to the further literature.

²⁰ Vanderspoel (2012) 235 n. 36, who closely follows the propositions made by Dagron (1974) 120–4.

²¹ Skinner (2008).

Introduction

first part of the fourth century. In order to trace this development within the broader context of the transformation of the social elites and of imperial rule in this period, I analyse each of the major periods in the imperial history of the era in turn – the late reign of Constantine from 324 to 337 in **Part I**, the early reign of Constantius as emperor of the East up to 350 in **Part II** and his sole rule up to 361 in **Part III**. Such a contextualized discussion of the engagement of the eastern elites in the imperial regimes of Constantine and Constantius between 324 and 361 yields new insights into the reconfiguration of the eastern elites and their inclusion in the senatorial order, and how this impacted on the political role of the senatorial elites in the empire. It highlights the important role played by the eastern elites as a source of political stability in a period of great political fragmentation and reformation in the later Roman Empire, and offers an important contribution to our understanding of the nature of imperial rule, the shape of the empire and the importance within it of the elites of Rome and Constantinople.

PART I

A UNIFIED ROMAN EMPIRE (AD 312-337)

CONSTANTINE AND THE SENATE OF ROME

*hinc ordo ueste clara / cum purpuris honorum / fausto precantur ore / feruntque
dona laeti. / iam Roma, culmen orbis, / dat munera et coronas, / auro ferens
coruscas / Victorias triumphis, / uotaque iam theatris / redduntur et choreis*

The order [of senators], distinguished in their robes [decorated] with the purple [stripes] of their honours, invoke these [vows] with their auspicious lips, and they happily present gifts. Already Rome, the capital of the world, is bestowing gifts and crowns, representing statues of Victory that glitter with gold for the triumphal processions. Already the vows are echoed in theatres and choruses. (Trans. Van Dam)¹

In his carefully crafted poem written for the attention of the emperor Constantine in the year 325, the Roman senator and poet Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius was offering advance praise for the approaching imperial visit to Rome the next year.² On the occasion the senate would rise to acclaim the emperor in their embroidered robes, Rome would rejoice in the glory of Constantine's successes, and acclaim the emperor in the streets and theatres of the city. According to conventional narratives, Optatianus' hopes were not fulfilled. Two ancient sources claim Constantine encountered popular dissent at Rome, and it is commonly believed that the visit in 326 was a failure. This view may seem supported by the fact that Constantine never returned to Rome, not even on the occasion of his *tricennalia* festivities in 336, the thirtieth anniversary of his accession, which were held in Constantinople, his new imperial city on the Bosphorus.³ Constantine's continuous absence from Rome

¹ Optatian. *Carm.* 20a.12–21, Van Dam (2011) 167. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

² On Optatianus and his poems, see Squire and Wienand (2017) with further refs.

³ Eus. *V. Const.* 4.49 with Av. Cameron (2005) 104.

is thought to reflect the marginalization of the city and its senatorial elite from the centre of power.⁴

Yet the fact that Constantine chose to remain absent from Rome after 326 does not imply that he neglected the city or its elites. Several honorary monuments set up to senators in Rome and the provinces cast light on the imperial relationship with Rome in the later reign of Constantine. They reveal that Roman senators were closely aligned with the imperial government, not only through their appointment to provincial posts across the empire but, crucially, also in Constantinople, and that Constantine sought and rewarded loyalty among this influential power group.

I shall here revisit the evidence for Constantine's relationship with the Roman senatorial aristocracy. I do not aim to offer a thorough reinvestigation of this relationship from 312 to 337, but to highlight some aspects of their relations that suggest continuous imperial interest in a mutually beneficial collaboration with Rome, in particular after his last visit to Rome in 326.⁵ My discussion shall start with a re-examination of his policies in relation to Rome after his return visit in 326. I argue that Constantine intensified his collaboration with Rome in this period: he employed Roman senators in his regime-building policies in the East after the defeat of Licinius in 324, and used the reunification of the empire to create several new senatorial posts in the West too, a policy that particularly benefited the senators from Rome, who were able to take up these high-ranking posts. The second section, 'Forging Political Alliances', then examines the beginning of their political alliance in 312 and its development over the following decade. This will reveal that following his first visit in 312 a mutually supportive political alliance had become established between Constantine and Rome. In particular, Constantine encouraged the involvement of Roman senators in his government as a way to consolidate his rule, especially in the provinces that he had transferred to his realm from Licinius. Having thus

⁴ Van Dam (2007) 50–7.

⁵ For a similarly positive assessment of this relationship, see Salzman (2016); Lizzi Testa (2013), (2009); Cameron (2005) 176; Marcone (1993); and Novak (1979).

Constantine and the Senate of Rome

established the character of their political relationship in the first part of his reign as emperor of Rome, the third section of the chapter, ‘Late Tokens of Favour’, then reconsiders other evidence for the cordial nature of the imperial relationship with Rome after 326, illuminating the exchange of tokens of favour which helped to maintain the unbroken bond between Rome and the absent emperor. In sum, this chapter will help to establish a more balanced account of Constantine’s involvement with the Roman senate, which can then serve as a useful basis from which to investigate Constantine’s policies in Constantinople in [Chapter 2](#).

Roman Senators in a Reunited Empire

Let us begin with Constantine’s relationship with Rome after this last visit to Rome in 326 and investigate the character of the emperor’s relations with the Roman senate following this event, which is conventionally believed to have resulted in the estrangement of the two parties. Constantine arrived in Rome on 18 or 21 July 326, several days ahead of his colourful *adventus* on 25 July, and remained until 3 August 326.⁶ The visit signalled imperial respect for Rome: after all, the Roman celebrations completed his vicennialian year, the twentieth anniversary of his rule, which he had opened with festivities in Nicomedia the year before and which were now repeated in Rome.⁷ The emperor used the celebrations for a display of dynastic unity: Constantine came to Rome flanked by several members of his extended family, including his half-brother Julius Constantius, who had become a member of the Roman aristocracy through his marriage, underlining the successful collaboration of senate and emperor.⁸ Perhaps he was also accompanied by the young Caesar Constantius II, with whom he shared the consulship in that year.⁹

⁶ Barnes (1982) 77.

⁷ Jer. *Chron.* a. 326: *uicennalia Constantini Nicomediae acta et sequenti anno Romae edita*.

⁸ Brothers: Amm. 14.11.27, see Barnes (2011) 164, (1981) 251.

⁹ The visit may have been intended to include the celebration of his sons’ *decennalia* as Caesars: Crispus and Constantine II would both have served ten years under

In Rome, Constantine displayed his qualities as *civilis princeps* and showed his respect for the political traditions of Rome. He addressed the senators in the senate house and he will have presided over the games in their presence, as was foreseen by the poem written by Optatianus for the occasion.¹⁰ It may have been on this occasion that the inauguration of the *Victoria Senati* games, circus games in honour of the ‘Victory of the senate’, was decreed. First mentioned in the Codex Calendar of 354, they will have been introduced earlier, and this visit would offer an appropriate political context for their inauguration at Rome. This suggestion is supported by the fact that the *Victoria Senati* games were celebrated on 4 August, only a few days later than the date of the vicennial games, which were held on 25 July.¹¹

Of particular interest in this context are several medallions that were minted for the occasion, to be given out as gifts to the rich and influential of the city at ceremonial audiences. Their message was strategically chosen: it celebrated the emperor’s relationship with the senate.¹² The coin with the greatest value, a gold medallion of 4.5 solidi, is also the most emblematic issue of this series. On its reverse, it depicts a laureate standing figure in a toga, holding a globe, the symbol of the world, and a sceptre, the symbol of rule. It is surrounded by the legend *SENATVS*. The obverse is decorated with the diademed bust of Constantine and the legend *CONSTANTINVS AVG(ustus)* (Figure 1.1).¹³

their father, and their rule would be celebrated in Rome (the *decennalia* of the *Caesares* were celebrated in a series of coins issued in Rome, *RIC* VII Rome 277, 228). However, shortly before the event Constantine’s relationship with Crispus, who resided in Trier, turned sour and the young prince was murdered. Constantine’s wife Fausta seems to have been implicated in some way, as she too disappeared from view. The reasons for Crispus’ death are debated, as is the date of his death: e.g. Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.11; Eutrop. 6 discussed in Potter (2013) 243–7; Frakes (2012) 94–5; for other scenarios: Lenski (2012b) 79. See also Wienand (2017) 128 n. 27 and Bleckmann (1996) 88–96.

¹⁰ *Carm.* 20a.12–21. The games in 312 are mentioned in *Pan. Lat.* 12(9) 19.6.

¹¹ Salzman (2016) 38 and Salzman (1990) 185–6 with comments on the spelling *Senati*, possibly an archaic genitive.

¹² Similarly Grünewald (1990) 141.

¹³ *RIC* VII Rome 272.

Constantine and the Senate of Rome



FIGURE 1.1 Gold medallion minted in Rome, (a) obverse depicting Constantine I looking upwards; (b) reverse a toga-clad figure with the legend *SENATVS*.

By permission of bpk / Münzkabinett, SMB / Lutz-Jürgen Lübke (Lübke and Wiedemann).

It has been argued that the reverse image represents the figure of Constantine clad in the toga of a consul and bearing in his hands the traditional emblems of the consuls, a *mappa* and a sceptre, and that they were hence issued to celebrate Constantine's consulship.¹⁴ This is suggested by the fact that the reverse motif is identical to that of a coin celebrating Constantine's consulship issued in Thessalonica and Trier.¹⁵ However, the *SENATVS* medallion from Rome differs from these coins in showing on the obverse a diademed bust of Constantine; it may have formed part of a special Roman series which celebrated the senate and people of Rome, and Constantine's cordial relationship with them.¹⁶ This is suggested by a silver coin with a similar upward-looking bust of Constantine, but bearing on the reverse a Genius with a globe in his right hand and a cornucopia, the sign of prosperity,

¹⁴ Identification with Constantine: Carson (1990) 172; R.-Alföldi (1963) 99; on the *regalia* of consuls: Sguaitamatti (2012) 26–41, Cameron (2011) 731.

¹⁵ *RIC* VII Trier 467–9; *RIC* VII Thessalonica 146.

¹⁶ Alföldi (1947) 12–13; R.-Alföldi (1999) 165–6, (1963) 99 who is, however, mistaken in arguing that this series in Rome included *EQVES* coins in honour of the equestrian order.

on his left arm. Its reverse legend reads *GENIVM P[opuli] R[omani]*, ‘The Genius of the Roman people.’¹⁷ Against this background, it is attractive to conclude that the Roman *SENATVS* medallions, with their impressive weight worth 4.5 solidi, were a celebration of a successful political alliance, reflecting the political importance of Constantine’s bond with the senate of Rome in the construction of his rule.

Nonetheless, two ancient literary sources suggest that Constantine fell out with Rome on this occasion. One is the sixth-century author Zosimus whose account is in turn based on a near-contemporary record of Constantine by Eunapius of Sardis.¹⁸ The other source is a speech by Libanius (*Lib. Or.* 19). Zosimus claims that Constantine incurred the hatred of the senators and people because he refused to go to the Capitol and thank Jupiter, as was traditional, with a state sacrifice for his success in war and in government; Zosimus adds that as a result Constantine moved to found another capital where he would erect a palace to undermine the importance of Rome.¹⁹ Many scholars have noted the highly confused chronology of this passage and argue that the refusal to sacrifice to which Zosimus alludes, if it occurred at all, cannot securely be dated to 326.²⁰ Zosimus’ account hence does not offer secure

¹⁷ *RIC* VII Rome 276. This coin drew on a paradigmatic legend from the Tetrarchy which Constantine had used repeatedly in Gaul before 315/16: *Genio Pop(uli) Rom(ani)*. *RIC* VII p. 48, minted only in *RIC* VII London 3, 22–3, 30–1, Trier 56–60, 84–5; Arles 52–4, 78 and Lyon 48–50. However, this Roman coin came with an innovative element in that it is the only example with the legend in the accusative of exclamation, meaning that when reading the legend aloud, the reader of the coin would acclaim the genius of the Roman people and with it the success of the emperor, see R.-Alföldi (1999) 165 on the accusative as a ‘beschwörende Anrufungsform’.

¹⁸ On these two historians and their work: Liebeschuetz (2003).

¹⁹ *Zos.* 2.29.1–5, 30, discussed in Wiemer (1994) 480–3, 488.

²⁰ This was suggested by Straub (1955), who locates the omission of the sacrifice in 312. Recent discussions of the long-standing debate on the date of Constantine’s omission of the sacrifice to Jupiter are: Grig (2009) 281; Diefenbach (2007) 133–53; A. Cameron (2005) 102; Curran (2000) 70–5; Fraschetti (1999) 9–127; Wiemer (1994) 481; Novak (1979) 275–7. Kuhoff (1991) convincingly argues for dating the omission to 312 (on the basis of the silence in the Latin panegyric of 313 (*Pan. Lat.* 12(9)) and of the absence of sacrificial imagery on the Arch of Constantine), as do Potter (2013) 145; Giuliani (2000); Fowden (1994) 164; Barnes (1981) 44 with n. 3, 307; Fraschetti (1986). A convenient summary of the voluminous debate is offered in Fraschetti (1999) 9–63.

evidence for friction between the two parties in 326. The other source that reports popular unrest during Constantine's visit is a speech written in 387, in which the Antiochean orator Libanius implores the emperor Theodosius not to punish the inhabitants of Antioch, who had destroyed imperial portraits during a violent riot. In support of his argument, he reports that the people and senate of Rome insulted Constantine with public invectives during one of his visits to the capital.²¹ The incident can be dated to 326, as it is only then that Constantine's brothers, who are mentioned by Libanius, could have accompanied him.²² The cause of the grievance is not known and, although a 'pagan reaction' to a forceful Christian policy of Constantine is traditionally evoked in this context, there is no indication that this was the core issue in the invectives. Most importantly, in Libanius the incident is not, as in Zosimus, said to have caused friction between the emperor and the Roman people. In fact, the incident is only mentioned by Libanius at all because of Constantine's mild reaction and the successful mitigation of the problem: instead of punishing the people, the emperor is said to have gained the admiring respect of Rome, by issuing an *edictum ad populum* in which he ordained that such (treasonable) behaviour should give emperors cause for laughter, not punishment.²³ The literary sources thus appear to suggest that, despite possible popular unrest, Constantine treated Rome with respect and care.

In view of this evidence it may be safe to conclude that Constantine was confronted with popular dissent while in Rome in 326, but the question at stake here is how these events affected his relationship with the Roman senate. A study of the career inscriptions of Roman senators in this period quickly reveals that arguments for a serious estrangement can be refuted: indeed, rather than becoming alienated, their collaboration even intensified after 326. This can be shown

²¹ Lib. *Or.* 19.19, 20.24 in Wiemer (1994). For a concise discussion of the Statues Riot: Kelly (1998) 154–5 (whose account is, however, based on the evidence of John Chrysostom); Elsner (1998) 57.

²² Wiemer (1994) 475–9.

²³ Lib. *Or.* 19.19 with Wiemer (1994) 470–2, 488–92.

in particular by the presence of Roman senators in high-ranking governorships in the prefecture of the East, which was reintegrated into the traditional *cursus honorum* following Constantine's victory over Licinius.

This was an important political development. Ever since the Roman Republic distinguished Roman senators had held office in the East, and this continued into the later third and early fourth century, when thirteen senators are attested as proconsuls of Asia or in high office in Syria (*praeses Palaestinae, consularis* or *praeses Syriae* or *Arabiae, iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis* or *legatus Augusti pro praetore*) under Aurelian and Diocletian (Appendix A).²⁴ At least one of them, the *praeses Syriae Coeles* and *iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis* Aelius Helvius Dionysius, had begun his career, as was traditional for a senator, in local office in Rome prior to his appointment to a correctorship in Italy.²⁵ Six of these officeholders, including Dionysius as well as the *praesides Syriae et Arabiae* and *iudices sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis* Virius Lupus and Locrius Verinus, and the proconsuls of Asia L. Artorius Pius Maximus, Junius Tiberianus, and Aurelius Hermogenes, concluded their careers with the highest senatorial office, the urban prefecture, a sign of their noble descent.²⁶ These careers reveal that the empire of Diocletian's Tetrarchy was shared but not partitioned.²⁷ The elevation of Constantius I however seems to have brought this pattern to an end: no Roman senator is attested in office in the prefecture of Oriens between 306 and 325.²⁸

Constantine reintroduced this pattern of appointing Roman senators to high office in the East following his victory over

²⁴ This list is based on *PLRE* I: 1075, 1105; Chastagnol (1962); Groag (1946) with revisions in Malcus (1967) 91–101 and Davenport (2013). These senators are also discussed in Leadbetter (2009) 161–3; Chastagnol (1992) 214–15 n. 40.

²⁵ *PLRE* I: 260 (Dionysius 12).

²⁶ *PLRE* I: 522 (Virius Lupus 5). *Contra*: Malcus (1967) 151 n. 2 who dates Lupus, a 'Stadttrömer von altem Adel', to 350–63. *PLRE* I: 950 + 951 (Verinus 1 + 2), 589 (Maximus 43), 912 (Tiberianus 7), 424 (Hermogenes 8), 260 (Dionysius 12).

²⁷ Leadbetter (2009) 163.

²⁸ For a detailed refutation of the view that *PLRE* I: 777 (Rufinus 15), urban prefect in 315–16, had been proconsul of Asia under Licinius: Malcus (1967) 97–9.

Licinius.²⁹ He revived old posts and also created new senatorial offices in the administration. I begin with the proconsulship in Asia ([Appendix B](#)). This had long occupied a privileged place in the administrative hierarchy; it conferred great social distinction on its holder. Proconsuls possessed appellate jurisdiction: this meant that their judgements could not be overturned by the praetorian prefect of the East, but only by the emperor to whom they were directly responsible.³⁰ Under Constantine, several Roman senators are attested in this office, including Domitius Zenophilus, Anicius Paulinus, Ceionius Rufius Albinus and Fabius Titianus.³¹ Inscriptions also show that, as was traditional, some of Constantine's proconsuls were accompanied by young senators, usually their relatives, who served them as legates.³² A similarly prestigious senatorial post was that of *comes Orientis*: resident in Antioch, he was the official representative of the praetorian prefect.³³ The post was established only later in Constantine's reign. The first securely recorded official with this title was the distinguished Roman senator Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus signo Mavortius in 335.³⁴ Prior to the establishment of this post, the region was governed by a *vicarius Orientis*.³⁵ Like the proconsulship of Asia, the post of *vicarius* or *comes Orientis* was not a new office but the successor of a senatorial office recorded

²⁹ This prosopographical study rests on *PLRE I*, published in 1964 with important revisions by Kuhoff (1983) 168–72; Barnes (1982) 147–58; Verdickt (1968); Malcus (1967); Chastagnol (1959); Groag (1946).

³⁰ Feissel (1998) 91–104; Verdickt (1968) 172. On the unappellate jurisdictional authority, reformed under Constantine: Harries (1999) 55, 111, 114–17; Verdickt (1968) 172–3; Jones (1964) 1: 481; it was granted to the urban prefect in Rome, the proconsul of Asia and the proconsul of Africa.

³¹ *PLRE I*: 993 (Domitius Zenophilus) + 1012 (Anonymus 37), 679 (Paulinus 14), 37 (Albinus 14) + 1006 (Anonymus 12), 918 (Titianus 6).

³² *PLRE I*: 530 (Madalianus 1), 875 (Tatianus 4). On Titianus' proconsulship in Ephesus, see also Feissel (2014), whose reconstitution of a fragmentary inscription suggests that in this official capacity Titianus was perhaps involved in building works at the mausoleum of the apostle John.

³³ Migl (1994) 89–94.

³⁴ *PLRE I*: 512 (Lollianus 5). He was probably a relative of L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, the last recorded proconsul of Pontus and Bithynia prior to Diocletian's reform: Wesch-Klein (2001).

³⁵ *PLRE I*: 590 (Maximus 49). On Maximus' social background, see also Roux (2014).

until 305, the *iudex sacrarum cognitionum per Orientem/totius Orientis* discussed above.

Constantine revived two senatorial posts in Syria subordinate to the *comes Orientis*: a *consularis* in the province of Phoenicia and, above it in rank, one in Syria, probably also around 330; the posts were occupied in sequence by the Sicilian Flavius Dionysius between 328 and 335. Dionysius may have been related to the eminent L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius whom I discussed above. Dionysius senior, following several minor offices in Rome and Italy, became *praeses Syriae Coeles*, *iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis*, proconsul of Africa in 289, and urban prefect in 301–2 (Appendix A).³⁶ This was not a new office: the new Syrian governorship evolved out of the senatorial *praeses Syriae Coeles*. Around 330, Constantine then also revived the senatorial governorship comprising the province of Pontus and Bithynia with its capital Nicomedia. This had been governed by a senatorial proconsul prior to its downgrading to equestrian level in Diocletian's administrative reforms. Its Constantinian governors included the senators Julius Aurelianus and L. Crepereius Madalianus.³⁷

Importantly, Constantine not only revived old offices, but also created new senatorial governorships: around 330, the two equestrian provinces of Phrygia and Caria in Asia Minor were reorganized under the senatorial *consularis* L. Castrius Constans. Four years earlier in 326 the provinces of Europa and Thrace on the western shore of the Bosphorus were reunited under the senatorial *consularis* Valerius Proculus, who was hence responsible for the development of Constantinople, which was perhaps the capital of the new combined province.³⁸ How can this policy be explained? Wolfgang Kuhoff has proposed that these conjoined governorships reflect a lack of reliable candidates for office.³⁹ Yet this view fails to explain

³⁶ *PLRE* I: 259 (Dionysius 11), 260 (Dionysius 12).

³⁷ *PLRE* I: 130 (Aurelianus 7) with Martindale (1980) Aurelianus 7; *PLRE* I: 530 (Madalianus 1). On the history of the province prior to the Tetrarchy: Wesch-Klein (2001).

³⁸ *PLRE* I: 219 (Constans 1) and 747 (Proculus 11) with Chastagnol (1962) 96–102 no. 40; see also Davenport (2013) 232 and Kuhoff (1983) 83.

³⁹ Kuhoff (1982) 277.

why Constantine created large senatorial rather than equestrian governorships in the first place. More to the point, the creation of these combined posts may have allowed improving imperial control over these regions while providing attractive posts to Constantine's loyal supporters in the Roman senate. On the basis of this evidence, the conclusion presents itself that Constantine employed Roman senators for political support in the East, in particular in Syria, Thrace and Asia Minor. In doing so, he was falling back on a pattern used by his imperial predecessors until 305.

Probably in order to facilitate the (re)integration of these eastern posts into this hierarchy of honours, around 324 Constantine instituted a far-reaching administrative reform that established a comprehensive senatorial *cursus honorum* incorporating all senatorial posts in the empire. How was this achieved? Central to the undertaking was the conversion of all senatorial governorships to the rank of *consularis*; for instance in two Italian provinces, Campania and Sicily, the titles of the senatorial governors were changed from *corrector* to *consularis*, to align them with the titles granted to the new senatorial governors in the East.⁴⁰ The new title of *consularis* was more attractive than the old *corrector*, as it conferred the rank of a suffect consul,⁴¹ making provincial posts more attractive to senatorial elites.⁴² The integration of the senatorial posts in the eastern administration into this *cursus honorum* allowed senators to resume traditional senatorial careers embracing posts in the West as well as the East.

Many of Constantine's senatorial officials in these newly available opportunities in the East were members of the most distinguished senatorial families, able to hold Roman priesthoods at a very early age, a sign of exclusivity and political influence.⁴³ Many came from families who could trace

⁴⁰ On this reform, which was continued under later emperors: Kuhoff (1983) 50–78; Barnes (1982) 140–74.

⁴¹ Salway (2015) 203; Delmaire (2013) 130; Kuhoff (1983) 37–9, 43–6; Arnheim (1972) 57; Chastagnol (1958) 221–53, esp. 223–33.

⁴² Cecconi (1994) 64.

⁴³ *PLRE* I: 747 (Proculus 11), 530 (Madalianus 1), 37 (Albinus 14) + 1006 (Anonymus 12) with Cameron (2011) 132–72, esp. 132–41. Paulinus certainly

their genealogy back to the second century AD, including the above-mentioned Paulinus as well as Ceionius Rufius Albinus (proconsul of Asia), Egnatius Lollianus (*comes Orientis*), Arrius Maximus (*consularis* in Syria) and Valerius Proculus (*consularis* in the province of Europa and Thrace).⁴⁴ Therefore, rather than being the recruiting ground for new eastern supporters (as is conventionally argued), the epigraphic record suggests that the new posts in the eastern administration had in fact become fertile ground for distinguished Roman senatorial supporters, who were able to continue the officeholding successes of their families.⁴⁵

Appointment to these posts became a mark of distinction. This is confirmed by the careers of the two senators Optatianus and Albinus. Following his recall from exile, Optatianus became proconsul of Achaëa around 326/329.⁴⁶ Albinus, too, seems to have been awarded the post of proconsul of Achaëa: his formal title was *proconsul Achaëa sortitus*, which implies that he had been allotted the office but had not taken it up.⁴⁷ Albinus probably preferred the more prestigious post of proconsul of Asia.⁴⁸ Many of Constantine's eastern senatorial officials were able to reach the highest senatorial honour, the urban prefecture, and many also became consuls.⁴⁹ Optatianus

also belonged to this circle of grand senatorial families and will have held such priesthoods, even though they are omitted on his preserved career inscriptions. Omission of priesthoods as a regular feature of career inscriptions: Cameron (2011) 132–41 with Witschel (2012) 375–80. *Contra* Barnes (1995) 139–40, who argues that the omission 'creates a strong presumption' that the honorand was a Christian. Compare Libanius on the leading municipal councillors in Antioch who monopolized liturgies in order to keep the council small: Lib. *Or.* 49.10; Sirks (2003); Liebeschuetz (1972) 148–40.

⁴⁴ *PLRE* I: 37 (Albinus 14), 512 (Lollianus 5), 586 (Maximus 33), 747 (Proculus 11).

⁴⁵ *Contra*: Kuhoff (1982) 277, who argues that the new senatorial posts in the East were created for a senate in Constantinople.

⁴⁶ *PLRE* I: 649 (Optatianus 3) with Wienand (2017) 135–40 and Davenport (2013). Contrast Barnes (1975a) 174–6, who dates Optatianus' proconsulship to 306.

⁴⁷ This suggests that the provincial governorships were assigned by lot in the senate of Rome, to be confirmed by Constantine, see Delmaire (2013) 139 with further refs.

⁴⁸ It is not necessary to assume that there were other reasons for Albinus' failure to take up the post other than that he declined it, *pace* *PLRE* I: 1006 (Anonymous 12) following Groag (1946) 16–20. The late example of *PLRE* I: 59 (Anatolius 3), who declined the offer of the urban prefecture of Rome in 355 (according to Lib. *Ep.* 391), is a case in point.

⁴⁹ The urban prefects of Constantine have recently been studied by Salzman (2016) 25–35. See also Marcone (1993) 649–52.

was, albeit very briefly, twice urban prefect in 329 and 333, a position held by Albinus for two years from 335 – when he was also made consul together with Constantine’s half-brother, Julius Constantius – to 337. Other urban prefects included Paulinus, Albinus and Proculus.

At least one of Constantine’s close senatorial supporters in the West, Proculus, was distinguished as *pontifex Flavianalis*. This appointment has several important implications. In his recent discussion of this priesthood, Alan Cameron has noted that it was probably attached to the (pagan) imperial cult of the *gens Flavia*, which is attested, for instance, in a long inscription from Hispellum; literary sources also attest Flavian priests in Africa in the 310s.⁵⁰ Two aspects of Proculus’ appointment to this priesthood are particularly revealing. First, while he, as a senator, was honoured with the priesthood of the cult, there were probably local officials, like the *pontifex gentis Flaviae* C. Matrinius Aurelius Antoninus of equestrian rank, who were responsible for organizing the gladiatorial games and theatrical shows attached to the cult (as their *editor*) on site. Proculus’ priesthood was perhaps an honorary one, allowing him to enjoy the privileges of the priesthood and the social distinction that went with it without any actual involvement in the organization of the games.⁵¹ This would fit with Aurelius Victor’s statement on this issue, which mentions only the priesthoods (in Africa), but no cult: initially, this was perhaps a nominal priesthood only.⁵² The Flavian priesthood probably continued a pattern established by Aurelian who in 274 had instituted a new college of *pontifices Solis* attached to the cult

⁵⁰ Cameron (2011) 140–1. Inscription: *ILS* 705 with important revisions by Gascou (1967). The date of the inscription from Hispellum is debated, but I follow Barnes (2011) 22 and Gascou (1967) 621–2 in the view that the rescript preserved on the inscription was probably sent from the court of Constans in the interregnum in summer 337, while the petition from Hispellum was perhaps sent to Constantine in his last months in office or shortly following his death. Africa: Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.28 (in c. 313).

⁵¹ Cameron (2011) 141. On Antoninus, see *PLRE* I: 75 (Antoninus 8) with Lepelley (1992) 355–8. As *editor*: *ILS* 6623. Cameron (2011) 141 attaches Proculus to the cult in Hispellum, which is likely given the short distance from Rome and the possibility that, as Cameron notes, Proculus possessed estates in the region.

⁵² Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.28: *tum per Africam sacerdotium decretum Flaviae genti*.

of his guardian god:⁵³ both priesthoods were reserved for the emperor's closest senatorial supporters. Two *pontifices Solis* have already been discussed: L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius and Virius Lupus, two influential and successful senators in service under Aurelian in high posts in the East.⁵⁴ Proculus' career was no less distinguished and he was, clearly, a close associate of Constantine. The suggestion, then, is that Constantine, again following a pattern established by his predecessors, established a cult that was closely linked to the ruling dynasty, and that the priesthoods of this imperial cult were reserved for his most distinguished senatorial supporters, who could thereby advertise their closeness to the imperial house.

Constantine's appointment policy may have expressed a desire both to unify the empire and to establish a sense of restoration and order. A powerful illustration of this aim is the career of Locrius Verinus from Etruria, who served Diocletian as *praeses Syriae* and *iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis* in 305. Locrius could be a promoted equestrian, but he may have been senatorial by birth. In any case, Locrius became a very prominent senator in Rome: he received a laudatory epigram from Symmachus alongside men like Aradius Rufinus, Valerius Proculus, Anicius Julianus and Petronius Probianus.⁵⁵ In the East, Locrius had held military authority and commanded troops in Armenia.⁵⁶ Locrius then returned to Rome, where Constantine appointed him to two further provincial posts, possibly two regional vicariates, one of them in Africa during the Donatist controversy. The emperor then put Locrius in charge of Rome from 323 to 325, during the main confrontation with Licinius, and made him its urban prefect.⁵⁷ Locrius was thus able to end his career on a high note just as his

⁵³ Cameron (2011) 133; Christol (1986) 65, 167–8.

⁵⁴ *PLRE I*: 260 (Dionysius 12); *PLRE I*: 522 (Lupus 5).

⁵⁵ *PLRE I*: 950 (Verinus 1) = 951 (Locrius Verinus 2), 775 (Rufinus 10), 747 (Proculus 11), 733 (Probianus 3), 473 (Julianus 23). On the epigrams, see Salzman and Roberts (2012).

⁵⁶ Symm. *Ep.* 1.2: *uirutem, Verine, tuam plus miror in armis, Eoos dux Armenios cum caede domares.*

⁵⁷ For the importance of this appointment, see also Potter (2013) 175. On his family background, see Salzman (2016) 28.

predecessors in office in the East had done in earlier decades. In turn, Constantine could move against Licinius in the knowledge that Rome was being administered by an experienced and loyal senator who knew the difficulties of waging war in the East and whose active support provided legitimacy for the emperor's aggressive eastern policies. Constantine could argue that his move against Licinius was motivated by the desire to restore the empire as of old. A close collaboration with these figures also highlighted his qualities as a legitimate and generous Roman emperor. Finally, the support of these outstanding social elites also gives the impression that his cause was a just one.

To summarize the discussion so far, under Constantine senatorial office in the East had again become the privilege of the Roman senatorial aristocracy. The data discussed reveal that after his victory over Licinius Constantine reactivated senatorial posts and appointed loyal Roman supporters to them. More significantly still, Constantine created two large new senatorial governorships, one in Asia Minor, probably as a response to the need for strong government in these regions in the aftermath of the defeat of Licinius, and one in the province of Europa, to oversee the development of Constantinople and the traffic of people, armies and goods across the Bosphorus. Many of the holders of these positions were members of the distinguished Roman nobility, scions of the very same families that had held these prestigious posts in the late third and early fourth centuries.⁵⁸ Constantine hence used the reunification of the empire in part to reintegrate the eastern senatorial posts into the Roman *cursus honorum*, which was expanded by several new posts in both West and East. While Constantine could use their prestige to further his imperial image across the empire, these Roman senators could advance their social status thanks to the personal honours they were granted by the emperor, including imperial priesthoods. These results suggest that Constantine and the Roman senate had been able to establish a fruitful political relationship since

⁵⁸ Nobility: Cameron (2011) 11.

Constantine's capture of Rome in 312, which made it possible for the emperor to use Roman senators for political support in the East. The next section proposes to investigate the character of this political alliance more closely by examining some of the senatorial policies put in place since 312.

Forging Political Alliances

The first official encounter between Constantine and the Roman senate had taken place on 29 October 312, when in a triumphal *adventus* Constantine led his army through the crowded streets and along the Via Sacra of the city of Rome.⁵⁹ Many senators had been actively involved in Maxentius' government, yet Constantine refrained from punishments or conscription. The emperor displayed *clementia*, retaining the urban prefect whom Maxentius had appointed only two days earlier, C. Annius Anullinus.⁶⁰ He also ordered the return to the senate of those senators who had been removed from the senatorial register by Maxentius: they were to be reinstated in their senatorial rank.⁶¹ First steps were taken to forge a political alliance between the new emperor and the Roman senators. Constantine addressed the senators in the senate house, and in his speech the emperor promised to restore the senate to its former authority: *pristina auctoritas*.⁶² He also legislated to resolve problems created by the change of government and the ensuing incriminations of senators.⁶³ In turn, the senate

⁵⁹ Eus. *V. Const.* 1.36–40, *HE* 9.9.1–11; *Pan. Lat.* 4(19) 30–3; 12(9) 19. On the nature of late antique *adventus* ceremonies and their triumphal character: Benoist (2005) 195–272; MacCormack (1981) 17–61; Fraschetti (1999) 243–69. On the Roman triumph more generally: Goldbeck and Wienand (2016); Beard (2007).

⁶⁰ *PLRE* I: 79 (Anullinus 3) with Barnes (1981) 45; Chastagnol (1962) 45–8 no. 16.

⁶¹ *CTh* 15.14.4. The law was probably announced in person by Constantine during his visit to the senate house: Corcoran (1996) 154–5. On the Theodosian Code more generally, see Matthews (2000a).

⁶² *Pan. Lat.* 12(9) 20.1–2; see also *Pan. Lat.* 4(10) 33.

⁶³ Constantine ruled that if property was seized by the fisc, for instance as a punishment arising from a court case, this was not to be petitioned for or sold for the duration of a year, granting the former owner a prescribed period to recover it; he also ordered that former grants of property by the fisc to individuals were to remain valid: *CTh* 10.1.1 from 13 September 315, see Corcoran (1996) 192–3. See also *CTh* 4.11.1, dated to May 216, on which see Corcoran (1996) 192 n. 96. On Constantine's laws sent to Rome, see also Gaudamet (1983).

bestowed on the emperor the title of *maximus* and legitimized his position as emperor of the western empire against the claims of Licinius and Maximinus Daia (who still ruled in the East); it was decreed that henceforth Constantine was to be the senior member of the college of emperors.⁶⁴ The political significance of this event is reflected in the fact that our most detailed account of Constantine's senatorial policies in Rome at this time is a panegyric delivered at the emperor's headquarters in Trier.⁶⁵

In 315 Constantine returned to Rome to celebrate his tenth imperial anniversary. A monumental arch dedicated by the senate on this occasion commemorated Constantine's *civilitas* and the liberation of Rome and its senate from the tyranny of Maxentius.⁶⁶ On the arch, Constantine is repeatedly portrayed as *civilis princeps*, thus signalling to the emperor the hopes and expectations of the senate in Rome.⁶⁷ Senate and people had also agreed to ascribe all Maxentius' building works to Constantine,⁶⁸ and had also signalled their interest in a successful collaboration by the erection of several honorary statues to the emperor in both gold and silver in 'the most crowded places' of Rome.⁶⁹ Their efforts were not in vain: around 314 Constantine began to convert equestrian provincial governorships to senatorial rank, providing new opportunities for senators to achieve high office in the provinces.⁷⁰ This occurred for the first time in the province of Byzacena in North Africa. In the process, the title of the new governor

⁶⁴ *Pan. Lat.* 20.12(9) 1–2 with Novak (1979) 281–2; Lact. *De mort. pers.* 44.11–12. Constantine as Maximus Augustus: see evidence discussed in Grünwald (1990) 86–92.

⁶⁵ *Pan. Lat.* 12(9).

⁶⁶ Constantine's *civilitas*: e.g. *Pan. Lat.* 4(10).34.1–4 and Lact. *De mort. pers.* 18.10. On the arch: Potter (2013) 164–9; Lenski (2014), (2008); Van Dam (2011) 124–46; Av. Cameron (2005) 95–6; Potter (2004) 361–6; Elsner (2000); Grünwald (1990) 63–86; Pierce (1989); MacCormack (1981) 36–8.

⁶⁷ E.g. in the *adventus*, the *adlocutio* and the *congiarium* scene, see Lenski (2014) 184–99.

⁶⁸ *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 40.25–6.

⁶⁹ *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 40.28.

⁷⁰ This reform occurred at the same time as the reform of the *suffect consulship*, which reduced the importance of this traditional office to Rome, on which see Salway (2015).

changed from *praeses* to *consularis*.⁷¹ Rather than being a recruiting ground for new men, these offices were awarded to existing senators in Rome. Many of them, including the members of the senatorial clan of the Aradii, had personal links in Africa; they could use these posts to strengthen their social and financial networks by even a short tenure of office in a provincial governorship.⁷² But this arrangement was also profitable for the emperor, who could draw on men who had the social prestige and personal patronage networks needed to secure stable government in regions he had only recently integrated into his imperial realm.

The collaboration seems to have satisfied imperial expectations. Over the following years, Constantine made similar arrangements in other provinces, notably in regions that he had recently wrenched from Licinius.⁷³ Following a decisive victory over Licinius at Campus Ardiensis in March 317, Constantine was able to enlarge his share of the empire and moved the imperial court from Trier to Sirmium.⁷⁴ The victory enabled him to incorporate into his realm most of Licinius' European territories on the Balkan peninsula, in particular the diocese of Moesia, including the Greek peninsula; Licinius retained his hold only on the dioceses of Oriens, Asia and Thracia (including the provinces Thracia, Moesia Inferior and Scythia).⁷⁵ Again, Roman senators were able to profit from these political developments. In 319 Aurelius Valerius Tullianus Symmachus (the grandfather of the better known urban prefect of 384, Quintus Aurelius Symmachus) was made a governor with his seat in Corinth.⁷⁶ It is usually

⁷¹ Administrative reforms: Davenport (2013) 231–2; Oshimizu (2012); Roman (2001) 458–69; Chastagnol (1992) 240; Barnes (1989a) 160–74; Kuhoff (1983) 58–78; Arnheim (1972) 5, 39–73 with review by Eck (1974); Jones (1964) 1: 106–7, 527. On its positive effect on the Roman aristocracy: Lizzi Testa (2009) 120–3.

⁷² On the Aradii: *PLRE* I: 1147 *stemma* 30 with Corbier (1999) 140–53; Novak (1979) 287–90. For the epigraphic evidence, see the tables provided by Oshimizu (2012).

⁷³ On the troubled relationship between Constantine and Licinius, see e.g. Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.1–9; Eutrop. 10.5.

⁷⁴ Harries (2012) 112; Potter (2004) 378–9; Lenksi (2012b) 74; Barnes (1981) 67, 72.

⁷⁵ *Anon. Val.* 5.18 with Davenport (2013) 231; Potter (2013) 171; Barnes (1982) 82. Also mentioned in Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.8.

⁷⁶ *PLRE* I: 863 (Symmachus 1) = 871 (Symmachus 6) with Cameron (1999).

argued that he was a *vicarius* of the diocese of Moesia, but two epigraphic finds from Argos and Megara suggest that he was proconsul (ἀνθύπατος) of Achaëa.⁷⁷ In 321/325 Constantine appointed the Roman senator Domitius Zenophilus to the post. In this position, Zenophilus was perhaps involved in the military provisions for the war against Licinius.⁷⁸ The revived proconsulship in Achaëa ranked above the regular provincial governorships, being considered by its holders a *dignitas* similar to the proconsulship of Africa or Asia.⁷⁹ The office thus promised an increase in status, fame and fortune back in Rome.

Simultaneously, new senatorial posts were created also in the western half of the empire. These changes occurred in particular in the heartland of senatorial landed interest, namely Italy and Africa, suggesting that their purpose was, above all, to meet senatorial demand for career advancement and social distinction.⁸⁰ By around 320 at the latest the African province of Numidia was converted from equestrian to senatorial rank; this also entailed the unification of two old equestrian provinces, Numidia Cirtensis and Numidia Militana.⁸¹ Numidia's new capital was Cirta; the city had suffered severe destruction in connection with the revolt of Domitius Alexander and its recapture by Maxentius in 308–9, but it was

⁷⁷ Argos: *IG* IV 1609, Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985) no. 27 = *LSA* 595 (U. Gehn); Megara: *IG* IV (2) 1128B = *LSA* 57 (U. Gehn) discussed most recently in Davenport (2013) 229–30; Barnes (1982) 160. *Contra*: e.g. Kuhoff (1983) 130–1, who also holds that Symmachus, while a member of the *Symmachi*, was still of equestrian rank in this office. Introduction of the proconsulship in Achaëa in 319 by Constantine rather than in 314 by Galerius: also argued by Davenport (2013) 231–2.

⁷⁸ *PLRE* I: 993 (Domitius Zenophilus) + 1012 (Anonymus 37), see also Davenport (2013) 230. Constantine is said to have assembled ships in Thrace (probably Thessalonica, *Anon. Val.* 25) and perhaps in the Piræus, see Rosen (2013) 241. The fleet in Piræus (argued for in Potter (2013) 211) is mentioned in Zosimus (2.22.1) in a passage that is perhaps based on the account of Praxagoras of Athens, who was probably echoing the famous naval battle at Salamis in this passage: Krallis (2014). Nonetheless, this does not exclude that it is based on fact.

⁷⁹ *Dignitas*: *AE* 1917/18, 99 = *ILAfr.* 456, discussed by Davenport (2013) 230–1.

⁸⁰ A detailed discussion of the posts created in this period is offered by Kuhoff (1983) 232–8.

⁸¹ Cecconi (1994) 57. See also Oshimizu (2012) 184.

rebuilt by Constantine, who renamed it Constantina.⁸² Again, the creation of a larger administrative unit may thus have been a response to the increased demand for centralized government in the region. Three new senatorial provinces were established in Italy around 320, when Constantine reversed Diocletian's changes and upgraded two equestrian provinces into one larger senatorial unit. This is attested for the provinces Aemilia and Liguria, Flaminia and Picenum and Campania. These provinces were of no military or strategic importance, yet they were of vital significance to the Roman aristocracy; for it was here, along with Sicily and Africa, that most senators possessed estates outside Rome.⁸³ In sum, the creation of new opportunities in Italy was a clever political move: it underlined that it was in the senators' financial and political interests in Italy to support Constantine against his imperial rival Licinius.⁸⁴

This close cooperation was not serendipity but the result of a strategic political alliance, as is indicated by several marriages between members of the imperial family and senators of Rome. There are at least three notable examples. The first is Constantine's sister Anastasia, who married the Roman noble Bassianus, brother of Senecio, a supporter of Licinius, shortly after his defeat of Maxentius.⁸⁵ The *cognomen* Bassianus derives from Bassus, which was the *cognomen* used by a grand Italian senatorial family that emerged in the third and early fourth century, the Caesonii. They were linked to the Anicii (like the urban prefect Anicius Paulinus mentioned above) and to the Asinii Nicomachi of Sardis and Sicily as well as to the Numii Albin Seneciones.⁸⁶ Another member of the imperial family, Constantine's sister Eutropia, was married around 320 to Virius Nepotianus, a member of a senatorial family whose ancestry

⁸² Revolt of Domitius Alexander and its suppression by Maxentius' praetorian prefect Rufius Volusianus, *PLRE I*: 976 (Volusianus 4); Lenski (2008) 209–10; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 17–19.28, 40.28.

⁸³ Lançon (2000) 62–4; Matthews (1975) 12–17.

⁸⁴ On the relationship between Constantine and Licinius in this period: Harries (2012) 111–13; Bleckmann (2011); Potter (2004) 377–9; Barnes (1981) 65–77.

⁸⁵ *PLRE I*: 58 (Anastasia 1), 150 (Bassianus 1), 820 (Senecio 1).

⁸⁶ Chausson (2007) 128 *stemma* figure 9 and 130 *stemma* figure 10. The Anicii are often considered to have been Christian because *PLRE I*: 679 (Paulinus 15) is called *sanctus* and *benignus* on *CIL VI* 1681; yet this is not conclusive evidence: see

went back to the second century and whom Constantine made consul in 336.⁸⁷ They had a son, Nepotianus. Finally, Constantine's half-brother Julius Constantius was married to Galla.⁸⁸ Galla was descended from one of the oldest senatorial families of Rome, the Neratii, and was by marriage related to the family of Septimius Severus: her blood was hence both senatorial and imperial.⁸⁹ The couple lived on Galla's landed estates in Etruria, where their son Gallus, the future Caesar, was born in 325/6.⁹⁰

These marriages had several important advantages. Constantine's dynasty could now pride itself on being connected to the grand families of Rome and could underline the legitimacy of his rule through their consent and support. More generally the alliances confirmed Constantine's respect for the senators and their political prestige, and added further weight to his intention to allow them to participate in the government of the empire. A revealing anecdote illuminates the close relationship between emperor and senators in this period. Anastasia's husband, the noble senator Bassianus, may have become central to a political manoeuvre in 315 designed to provoke Licinius: in order to exclude Licinius' recently born son (the child of Licinius' wife, Constantine's sister Constantia) from the succession, Constantine is said to have named his brother-in-law Bassianus as Caesar with authority

Cameron (2011) 180–1, and Novak (1979) 180, who points to a vestal virgin (*CIL* VI 2131) so described. Also, the fact that Paulinus' career inscriptions do not list Roman priesthoods cannot be used to infer that he was not a pagan, as they were omitted on certain monuments but included in others: Weisweiler (2012a) 318; Witschel (2012) 375–80. Salzman (2016) 27–8 furthermore points out that there is no extant source suggesting (Christian) faith as a reason for the success of the Anicii: where reference is made to any reasons, it is to their wealth, nobility and power.

⁸⁷ *PLRE* I: 316 (Eutropia 1), 625 (Virius Nepotianus 7). He was the descendant of *PLRE* I: 624 (Nepotianus 6), consul in 301; see Barnes (2011) 171.

⁸⁸ *PLRE* I: 226 (Constantius 7), 382 (Galla 1).

⁸⁹ Chausson (2007) 124 *stemma* figure 8.

⁹⁰ Chausson (2007) 124–5. *Contra*: Barnes (2011) 171, who holds that Julius Constantius' first wife is unknown and that Gallus was the son of his second wife Basilina and so the brother of Julian. This is contradicted in Barnes (1993) 105, where Julian is Gallus' half-brother, and on p. 106 Cerealis, the brother of Galla, is called Gallus' maternal uncle.

over Italy.⁹¹ The point is not whether this is based on fact, but rather that it seemed plausible that Constantine would rely on a leading Roman senator to bolster his position ahead of his confrontation with Licinius.

Constantine and the senate remained in close contact even at a distance. Letters were exchanged between him and those with literary ambitions in Rome, who could take pride in counting the emperor among their admirers.⁹² There will also have been regular embassies to the imperial court, and senators were able to join Constantine in the provinces.⁹³ As a sign of favour to the wealthy and ambitious, the emperor granted additional fiscal privileges to senators, legislating in particular on the right of inheritance, landed wealth and the position of minors.⁹⁴ Around 322 Constantine may also have created a *praetor Constantinianus* in Rome.⁹⁵ Both these policies will have benefited in particular the wealthy senatorial families, for whom it was now easier to secure wealth and boost their status and influence. In turn, Constantine could style himself as father of the senate (and senators).

As a matter of course, Constantine also arranged for an imperial presence in Rome. Two of his closest female relatives, his wife Fausta and his mother Helena, were to reside in Rome. Fausta, born and raised in Rome and of imperial descent – she was the daughter of Diocletian’s fellow ruler, the emperor Maximian – will have been well acquainted with leading senatorial circles in Rome.⁹⁶ Her Roman palace is likely to have stood on the Lateran, close to the former site of the demolished camp of Maxentius’ military supporters, the

⁹¹ The story of Constantine’s plan to elevate Bassianus to Caesar in Italy and the betrayal of Bassianus (he was persuaded by Licinius and his brother Senecio to take up arms against Constantine) is told in *Anon. Val.* 5, with Potter (2013) 169; Barnes (1975a) 186.

⁹² Eutrop. 10.7. On Optatianus’ letters, see in particular Wienand (2017), (2012a) 353–96, (2012b), (2012c); and also Van Dam (2011) 158–62; Barnes (1981) 44–8.

⁹³ E.g. the case of Optatianus in the early 320s, discussed in Wienand (2017) 126.

⁹⁴ Fiscal privileges: *CJ* 6.56.3 (315), *CTh* 5.1.1, 11.35.1, 2.6.3 (317–19); right of inheritance: *CTh* 2.19.2 (321); *patria potestas*/landed wealth: *CTh* 8.18.2 (319) with Harries (2012) 150–1. Position of minors: *CTh* 3.32.1+2 = *CJ* 5.71.18, 7.62.17 (322).

⁹⁵ This is discussed in detail in Chapter 2, pp. 69–72.

⁹⁶ *PLRE* I: 325 (Fausta), *PLRE* I: 573 (Maximianus 8).

Praetorian Guard.⁹⁷ After Constantine's seizure of the city in 312, the representation of the imperial family in Rome was further consolidated when Helena moved to join Fausta in the capital.⁹⁸ Helena took up residence in the Sessorian Palace on the southeastern edge of the city,⁹⁹ whence she supervised Constantine's building activities, including the construction of Christian churches but also restoration works on baths in the name of her son and grandsons.¹⁰⁰ It is possible that, like Fausta, Helena held court and heard petitions, thereby sparing interested parties, including senators, the need to travel to Constantine's constantly moving *comitatus*. Imperial presence was also staged on other ceremonial occasions. For instance many imperial events were publicly commemorated in Rome. The *Codex Calendar* of 354 suggests that Rome regularly celebrated the key events in the rise of Constantine to sole rule in the West.¹⁰¹ The emperor's *decennalia* in the summer of 315 then offered a welcome opportunity to stage a festive celebration of the new ruler when Constantine returned to Rome for the occasion. Constantine's presence will have been felt even more strongly if these games were presided over by members of the imperial house. Their involvement in public entertainment in Rome is suggested by the existence of an amphitheatre and a circus close to the residences of Fausta and Helena,¹⁰² though a lack of sources means that the presence of the empresses at these imperial festivals cannot be established beyond doubt.

⁹⁷ *Domus Faustae* and Lateran palace: Fried (2007); Scrinari (1991). On Fausta in Rome, see also Hillner (2017).

⁹⁸ On Helena in Rome: Drijvers (1992) 30–4. It is not clear whether Helena previously lived in Trier: Drijvers (1992) 21–30.

⁹⁹ Lenski (2012b) 78; Drijvers (1992) 45–8.

¹⁰⁰ On Constantine's building activities in Rome, see *Pan. Lat.* 4(10) 35.4–5 with Hunt (2003) and Scheithauer (2000) 212–20 with further refs.

¹⁰¹ It is unclear when these festivities were introduced. The *Calendar* describes the situation in the mid-350s, when Rome's imperial festivals were being held in honour of Constantius II, yet the likelihood that these games were all introduced under his successors rather than by Constantine himself is rather small. These *ludi uotiu* are discussed in Salzman (1990) 140–1. For the importance of these games as a constant reminder of imperial presence, see Humphries (2015) esp. 153–5, (2007) 33–7. On the *Codex Calendar* and the Roman public festivals in the fourth century: Salzman (1990) esp. 116–89; Bagnall et al. (1987) 47–8; Stern (1953).

¹⁰² Potter (2013) 164.

The discussion so far has revealed that Roman senators were able to benefit from their cordial alliance with Constantine and from imperial attention to their career and financial interests. In turn Constantine was able to draw on the Roman senate to legitimize his war against Licinius. Their relationship was maintained through letters, imperial presence in Rome and other tokens of favour to Rome. Against this background, it is likely that the return of the emperor in 326 I examined in the first section was eagerly expected: like his earlier visits in 312 and 315, this heralded an increase in the collaboration.¹⁰³ That section showed that Constantine did not fall out with the Roman senate following his visit to Rome in 326. Rather, Constantine created new opportunities for senators to advance their status through participation in imperial government as governors in high-ranking provinces. Having examined the nature of Constantine's political alliance with Rome until 326, it is now possible to investigate the character of his relationship after his visit in 326 as it was reflected in his policies in Rome.

Late Tokens of Favour

Constantine's relationship with Rome following his return visit in 326 has received less attention than the events following his visits in 312 and 315. In this section, I shall discuss some aspects which reveal that their bond remained unbroken despite Constantine's continued absence from Rome.¹⁰⁴ Following his visit in 326, Constantine continued to act as a judge in matters of intra-senatorial rivalry. Probably as a result of senatorial petitioning in Rome, following his visit Constantine made some personal grants of imperial favour to influential members of the resident Roman aristocracy. At least two prominent Roman aristocrats were recalled from exile.¹⁰⁵ One was Ceionius Rufius Albinus, son of Constantine's first urban

¹⁰³ Expectation: voiced in *Pan. Lat.* 4(10) 38.5–6.

¹⁰⁴ On the politics of imperial absence or presence in late antique Rome, see now the contributions to *AntTard* 25 (2017).

¹⁰⁵ Van Dam (2011) 162–7.

prefect, Volusianus.¹⁰⁶ Albinus' exile was due to charges of adultery.¹⁰⁷ The other senator known to have received a pardon was the senatorial poet Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius. Optatianus seems to have been exiled between late 322 and early 323, also on the charge of adultery.¹⁰⁸ In his case (and perhaps also in Albinus'), the exile may have been the result of senatorial infighting, since his rise in status under Constantine may have caused envy and resentment among his fellow senators.¹⁰⁹ In order to have his sentence revoked, Optatianus composed a volume of exquisite panegyric poems for Constantine on the occasion of his Roman *vicennalia* celebrations on 25 July 326.¹¹⁰ Constantine recalled Optatianus from exile and awarded him several important offices in the following years, including the proconsulship in Achaëa and the urban prefecture.¹¹¹

Constantine may also have assisted senators' under-age sons, by facilitating their entry into the senate and their appointment to the provinces. In a line of Symmachus' epigram on Julianus, the urban prefect of 326, the latter is eulogized for having brought aid and assistance: *conferre iuuare paratus*; he was in fact so eminent that Symmachus concluded that Julianus' name was eternal in Rome: *aeterno complebat nomine Romam*.¹¹² This may imply that Julianus had been able to profit from the coincidence of his urban prefecture with the imperial visit. It may have allowed him to claim credit for the opportunities the visit provided to senators to put pressure on the emperor for employment in the East, but also for legislation in their

¹⁰⁶ *PLRE* I: 37 (Albinus 14) + 1006 (Anonymous 12) with Chastagnol (1962) 92–6 no. 92; Van Dam (2011) 162–7; Barnes (1982) 108, (1975b).

¹⁰⁷ Wienand (2017) 126 n. 19.

¹⁰⁸ Wienand (2017) 124–32. As Wienand points out, Optatianus' exile was thus not linked to that of Volusianus 4 as had been argued by Barnes e.g. (1981).

¹⁰⁹ Victim of senatorial rivalries: Van Dam (2011) 162–3. On Optatianus' early career see Wienand (2017) 141–8; following a long process of courting the emperor's attention through his poetic letters, Optatianus was finally allowed to join the imperial campaign against the Sarmates in 322.

¹¹⁰ The date of the presentation of the poems to Constantine is debated: Barnes (1975a) 184; but Optatianus affirms in several passages of his poems that they were to reach Constantine on that occasion (*Carm.* 4.1, 5.8, 9.35, 16.35, 19.33), see Wienand (2017) 124–35.

¹¹¹ Optatianus became proconsul of Achaëa between 326 and 329 and twice (for about a month each time) urban prefect in 329 and 333, see pp. 24–5 above.

¹¹² Symm. *Ep.* 1.2.5.

financial interest and those of their sons. For in the late 320s the emperor improved the situation of under-age quaestors and praetors: both were exempted from the compulsory fine imposed on older quaestors and praetors absent from Rome during the games they were obliged to stage.¹¹³ This is remarkable, as it was by election to the office of quaestor that young *clarissimi* by birth, who were in a position to seek admission to the senate, were formally enrolled, while the praetorship allowed them to seek a post in the provinces.¹¹⁴ Constantine's decision to remove the fine greatly benefited the wealthy traditional senatorial families, keen to enrol their sons at the earliest possible date. They now faced fewer obstacles to sending their under-age sons, some of them younger than 16, to the senate. Finally, a fragmentary inscription of an honorary statue to Rufius Albinus, the urban prefect of Rome from 335 to 337, seems to claim that Albinus was able to persuade the emperor restore 'the right of the senate' (*auctoritas*) to co-opt quaestors and praetors without the interference of the emperor.¹¹⁵ So, while in theory the new senatorial posts examined above provided opportunities also for new men to acquire senatorial rank, these measures regarding young senators made

¹¹³ *CTh* 6.4.1 (329). Pace Novak (1979) 280.

¹¹⁴ *CTh* 6.4.1 (329), 6.4.2 (327). On these magistracies, see Jones (1964) 530. *Contra*: Chastagnol (1992) 243–4, who holds that entry was through the praetorship. There were two types of quaestors: the so-called *quaestores candidati* who had to stage games held on 8 and 20 December, and the titular *quaestores arcarii*, who received financial assistance from the imperial fisc (in the person of its employees, the *arcarii*), whose games were held in honour of the imperial cult on 4, 5, 6, 19, 21 and 23 December, on which see Salzman (1990) 123, 181, 186 n. 259; Chastagnol (1992) 242–5. Chastagnol argued that the former were elected on the recommendation of Constantine; this looks attractive, as it would suggest that the attested *quaestores candidati*, all members of the Roman aristocracy, were actively supported by the emperor at the beginning of their career. However, there is no secure evidence for this. Chastagnol also suggests that *quaestores candidati* could advance to a senatorial career, while the *arcarii* were granted access to the senate, yet were not allowed to apply for posts. This hypothesis holds only if his claim stands that all epigraphically recorded quaestors were *candidati*. For the importance of holding a quaestor- or praetorship in the life of a young senator, see Watts (2015) 72–3.

¹¹⁵ *CIL* VI 1708 = 31906 = *ILS* 1222 with Seck (1884); Lizzi Testa (2013) 359–60; and Chastagnol (1992) 254–8, but with some reservations: I do not agree with Chastagnol that the issue at stake is granting the senate the authority to vote on the admission of imperial *adlecti*.

it possible for the traditional senatorial aristocracy to maintain its primacy in the competition for these offices, and for Constantine to draw on an ever-increasing pool of wealthy senators from Rome.

The position of the elite senators was also bolstered by Constantine's reforms of the urban prefecture. Awarded at the end of a successful career, under Constantine its holders were mostly members of prominent senatorial families of Rome rather than new men.¹¹⁶ Constantine seems also to have enlarged the prefect's authority over the neighbouring provinces. The question is complicated, and the following provides only a brief overview. At the time, the Italian diocese was split into two vicariates: the northern regions were governed by a *vicarius* responsible to the praetorian prefect of Italy, the southern, so-called *urbicariae* or *suburbicariae* provinces were assigned to another *vicarius*. An earlier reform, probably from c. 315, had improved the efficiency of the administration of the Italian peninsula, but may have reduced the scope of the urban prefect's responsibilities by placing the *vicarius urbicarius* under the authority of the praetorian prefect of Italy instead of that of the urban prefect. If so, as has been pointed out, in particular the traditional Roman senatorial families, whose members had occupied the posts for centuries, may well have resented this imperial ruling.¹¹⁷ This idea is attractive, but the documentation for the administration of the Italian peninsula in the first half of the fourth century is too scanty to allow any conclusive reconstruction of its development in this period.¹¹⁸ While it is thus possible that in 326 Constantine once again subordinated the *vicarius urbicarius* to the urban prefect, restoring the office to its traditional position of authority in a meaningful gesture of imperial favour to the Roman aristocracy, this cannot be demonstrated with any certainty. After 330, Constantine then equipped the urban prefect with additional authority over Rome's administration.

¹¹⁶ *PLRE* I: 473 (Julianus 23), 733 (Probianus 3), 679 (Paulinus 15) and 37 (Albinus 14). On Constantine's choice of urban prefects, see also Salzman (2016) 25–35.

¹¹⁷ Chastagnol (1960) 32–6; see also Lo Cascio (2005) 180–1.

¹¹⁸ Migl (1994) 109–16.

In this period, traditional *curatela*e of Rome, responsible for instance for the maintenance of its aqueducts, buildings or ports, were gradually incorporated into the staff of the urban prefect, and new posts, such as the *curator* responsible for the statues of Rome, were from the outset attached to the prefecture.¹¹⁹ This move benefited the Roman senatorial nobility, who monopolized these posts under Constantine's rule.¹²⁰ It also allowed Constantine to secure his hold on the city. The view proposed by André Chastagnol and Gilbert Dagron, who have tried to explain this move with reference to the emperor's aversion to the Roman aristocracy and their pagan religion, and with Constantinople in mind, must thus be rejected.¹²¹ There is no evidence for the idea that Constantine was thinking of Constantinople when legislating in Rome.¹²² On the contrary, Constantine's policies in Rome look Roman.

The *follis* tax or *collatio glebalis*, introduced in 326, may perhaps also be located in this context of furthering the social position of wealthy senators. It is traditionally presented as a price for appointment to high office.¹²³ This additional tax was a convenient means by which to guarantee that a person had the wealth to justify his status as senator. The tax was levied annually and assessed by the *censores*, with whom all members of the senatorial class had to register and declare their property.¹²⁴ Was this the price of reintegration into government? If so, it would also serve to disqualify men of insufficient

¹¹⁹ Kuhoff (1983) 43–6; Chastagnol (1960) 30–63 provided a detailed, if at times boldly optimistic, reconstruction of the transformation of the *curatela*e/curatorships. I remain sceptical, however, as to whether the scanty evidence supports his view that the reform was largely concluded in early 330. More likely is that this was a gradual process up until the reign of Valentinian. On the rise in status and authority of the urban prefect under Constantine, see also Salzman (2016) 24–5.

¹²⁰ Salzman (2016) 24–35. Families: Novak (1979) 286–302, 306.

¹²¹ Dagron (1974) 227–8; Chastagnol (1960) 404–5.

¹²² *Contra*: Dagron (1974) 228: 'Constantin légifère à Rome en pensant à Constantinople, ou du moins avec le souci de mettre en place une administration urbaine qui soit éventuellement transférable dans la nouvelle capitale'.

¹²³ Zos. 2.38.4. E.g. Arnheim (1972); undecided between the dates 312 and 326 as regards the timing of its introduction: Salzman (2016) 17.

¹²⁴ *CTh* 6.2.13 (383), 6.2.17 (397); Dagron (1974) 149–50; Jones (1964) II: 430–1, 537; Petit (1957) 369. For the rates to be paid in the three tax classes, see now Moser (2016b) 438–9, n.8 with further refs.

personal funds from the senatorial order and so would establish a hierarchy in which the wealthy Roman senators ranked first.¹²⁵

Alongside this measure, Constantine again provided for a continuous imperial presence in Rome. His sister Constantia, who had been married to Licinius, was sent to the city in c. 325.¹²⁶ The circumstances surrounding the honorary statue set up to her between 326 and 333 suggest that she carried on Helena's duties, also with regard to Constantine's building programme.¹²⁷ Yet it remains the case that Constantine himself never returned to Rome. In his poems Optatianus had anticipated the emperor's return for his *tricennalia* in 335: in *Carmen* 5.35 he praises in advance the successful conclusion of Constantine's thirtieth imperial anniversary in Rome: *pio tricennia suscipe uoto*, 'receive our pious wishes for your *tricennalia*'. Other evidence from Italy suggests that his visit was expected there.¹²⁸ But hopes for a further visit were not fulfilled.

Nonetheless, there are signs of Constantine's continuous interest in Rome. Perhaps one of the most powerful is a monument in Rome that is a useful source on the imperial relationship with the city in Constantine's later reign. It is an honorary statue of the urban prefect Proculus, which was set up in the Forum of Trajan.¹²⁹ This honour reveals that Roman senators were closely aligned with the imperial government in the East through their appointment to provincial posts (as examined above) and honours at court and that Constantine sought and rewarded loyalty among this influential power group. In an *oratio*, a formal letter to the senate, inscribed on one side-panel of the base, Constantine ordered the erection of a statue to

¹²⁵ See also Schlinkert (1996) 123 in his discussion of several laws from the late fourth century. For taxes as a means to justify status: Potter (2004) 397–8.

¹²⁶ *PLRE* I: 221 (Constantia 1).

¹²⁷ *CIL* VI 1153 = 40777 = *LSA* 1385 (Machado).

¹²⁸ Van Dam (2007) 54–6, n. 26.

¹²⁹ *AE* 1934.138 = *LSA* 2685. On the senatorial epigraphic monument in Rome in general, see Chenault (2012); Weisweiler (2012a), (2012b); Machado (2010); Niquet (2000).

Proculus, in compliance with the request of the senate, which had petitioned the emperor to grant Proculus this honour.¹³⁰ Constantine's reply does not avow any close connection between himself and Proculus, yet only a few individuals were granted the honour of such gilded honorary statues, so they were an important means of demonstrating closeness to the emperor; especially when the court was absent from Rome, they became a sign of distinction in senatorial circles.¹³¹ Before Proculus, Anicius Paulinus had also been honoured in this way.¹³² Like Proculus, Paulinus, the scion of two successful senatorial families, the Anicii and the Caesonii, could boast of his pedigree and career: Paulinus had served as proconsul in Asia and was able to crown his career with appointment as urban prefect in 334.¹³³ If these officials were often granted the honour of a statue, then this underlines the eagerness of the Roman senate to maintain its links with the imperial court and publicly display its participation in government.¹³⁴ At the same time, statues such as these allowed Constantine to show that he was the legitimate emperor, who cared for Rome and supported its elite. The surviving base of Proculus' statue inscribed with Constantine's letter still stands in the Forum of

¹³⁰ *AE* 1934, 158. On this meaning of *orationes*: Weisweiler (2012a) 310; Feissel (2009) 103–8; Harries (1999) 50–1; Millar (1992) 354–5; Dagron (1974) 142; Jones (1964) 1: 330–1. For other such imperial speeches to the senate, see the epigraphically recorded address of Constantius II to the senate of Constantinople (Chapter 5, pp. 189–96) and the *Demegoria Constantii* discussed in Chapter 6, p. 216. For an archaeological survey of the forum, see Bauer (1996) 93–102; on its role as a centre of statuary representation: see Chenault (2012); Schmidt-Hofner (2012) 51–2; Weilweiler (2012a), (2012b).

¹³¹ Weisweiler (2012a), (2012b).

¹³² *ILS* 1221 = *LSA* 1395 (Machado) now lost.

¹³³ *PLRE* I: 679 (Paulinus 14) with Chastagnol (1962) 90–2 no. 38. His father *PLRE* I: 473 (Iulianus 23) was consul in 322 and urban prefect in 326, his uncle *PLRE* I: 679 (Paulinus 15) had been consul in 325 and urban prefect for two years from 331 to 333, his uncle by marriage *PLRE* I: 154 (Bassus 12), a member of the traditional senatorial family the Caesonii, was consul in 317, a relative, probably his brother, served as praetor in 321, *PLRE* I: 681 (Paulinus 17). On the Anicii: Novak (1979) 290–4, who notes that 'their domination of the most prestigious civil posts in government is unparalleled' (at 290), with *PLRE* I: 1133 *stemma* 7 and pp. 32–3 n. 86 above on their (uncertain) religious affiliations. On the Caesonii: *PLRE* I: 1137 *stemma* 11.

¹³⁴ On the role of such monuments in the relationship between emperor and Roman aristocracy: Weisweiler (2012a), (2012b); Millar (1992) 354–5.

Trajan and is therefore perhaps the most long-lasting reminder of the mutually supportive relationship between Constantine and the Roman elite after the foundation of Constantinople.

To summarize these results: contemporary documents from Constantine's visit to Rome in 326 reveal that the emperor travelled to Rome to celebrate his good rapport with Rome and its senatorial aristocracy, an intention that was highlighted also by several coins minted in connection with the visit. Traditional arguments postulating a friction with Rome and its senate in the visit's aftermath have been shown to lack substance: to the contrary, the political influence of Roman senators was greatly enlarged following Constantine's Roman *vicennalia*. They were able to govern an increasing number of important provinces throughout the empire and in Italy. Constantine also granted personal favours, legislated to the advantage of the established senatorial families in Rome and expanded the authority of the urban prefect. Late honorific statues for Proculus and Paulinus then suggest that the imperial visit allowed the consolidation of a successful strategic partnership, which was upheld by appointing senators to high office in both Rome and Constantinople.

Conclusion

This chapter has re-examined Constantine's relationship with the Roman senate between 312 and 337 and in particular after his last visit to Rome in 326. Against the conventional view, I argue that Constantine's vicennialian visit in 326, a celebration of the traditions – and above all the senators – of Rome and their power and influence, did not profoundly alter the imperial relationship with Rome. Following a pattern established since his first entry into Rome in 312, Constantine reactivated the senatorial posts that had existed in the prefecture of the East until the abdication of Diocletian in 305, and reintegrated them into the traditional *cursus honorum*. In so doing, as also in Africa and Achaëa, the emperor created larger administrative units that responded to the need for effective administration in the important urban centres of the East, notably Nicomedia, Constantinople and Antioch. The same effect may have been

achieved by the appointment of grand Roman senators to these posts: they had the necessary commanding prestige to impose Constantinian rule in the provinces. Roman senators such as Proculus were awarded high offices and other distinguished honours, demonstrating Constantine's close relation with the Roman senate and his esteem for the traditions of the empire despite his absence from Rome.

Often overlooked but of vital importance in the context of Constantine's relationship with Rome are several political marriages between Constantine's brothers and sisters and members of the old senatorial families of Rome, which acknowledged the political influence of these families and underlined a reciprocal interest in collaboration. The same holds for the residence of members of the imperial family at Rome, which conferred on the city and its elite the honour of imperial presence (and, probably, easier access to the emperor), as well as for his legislation on minors and praetors in Rome.

When Constantine died in May 337, the people of Rome were greatly displeased with the decision not to bury Constantine in their city because, according to Aurelius Victor, they believed that through his victories, laws and style of government Constantine had effectively renewed the city of Rome.¹³⁵ As this chapter has revealed, it is likely that many Roman senators agreed. Under Constantine Roman senators were once again able to hold high office all across the empire and so to extend their personal networks in these regions and at the imperial court. As far as their interests were concerned, or so the senators made known to their emperor in an equestrian statue monument erected in the Forum Romanum under the auspices of Anicius Paulinus, prefect of Rome in 334 and previously proconsul of Asia, Constantine had indeed enlarged the Roman state over the entire world with his deeds and decisions: *ob amplificatam toto orbe rem publicam factis consultisq(ue)*.¹³⁶

¹³⁵ Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.17.

¹³⁶ *ILS* 698 = *CIL* VI 1141 + 31246 + p. 845 = *LSA* 126. On the equestrian statue: Van Dam (2007) 53; Bauer (1996) 7–79; Verduchi (1995). See also *Pan. Lat.* 4(10) 33, 35.1–2.

CONSTANTINE'S EASTERN ROMAN EMPIRE

In late 324, Constantine celebrated a final victory over Licinius, completing his rise to sole rule.¹ This was no minor achievement: after several decades of fragmentation, one emperor again ruled all the provinces of the empire. But to succeed as ruler Constantine had to establish a fruitful relationship with the elites of his empire. He had to win support among the eastern population whose emperor he had just defeated, while at the same time satisfying the demands of his old allies in Italy, Africa and Greece who had supported him in his campaigns against Licinius. How could this be achieved? It has been suggested that Constantine met this challenge by forming a new political elite in Constantinople. Two institutions have been identified as crucial to this undertaking. The first is the order of imperial companions, the *comites*, a structure that rewarded loyalty to the imperial cause rather than social rank; it thus had the potential to displace the senators from their leading social status in the imperial hierarchy.² The second institution said to have been established by Constantine to consolidate his hold on the East is the senate of Constantinople. In 1994 Peter Heather, whose work on this has been influential in particular among English-speaking scholars, proposed that the senate's foundation was part of Constantine's policy of winning the support of the eastern curial elites. He writes: 'The foundation of a second imperial senate must be seen as part

¹ On the relationship between Constantine and Licinius: Harries (2012) 111–13; Bleckmann (2011); Schneider (2007) 64–75; Lenski (2012b) 72–7, Hermann-Otto (2007) 95–118; Potter (2004) 377–82. Kienast (1966) 133–45 describes their respective fleets. On Licinius' rule in the East: e.g. Potter (2004) 364–7.

² Order of *comites*: e.g. Potter (2004) 387–91, esp. 386–9.

of a programme of measures to generate from scratch sufficient support to create a working governmental machine in the eastern Mediterranean.’ And: ‘Its main aim was to attract the landowning elites without whom Constantine would have been unable to govern in the East.’³ If this were correct, then such an institution would have had the potential to rival the old senate in Rome, even if, as argued by Heather, this was not its primary aim. More recently, Alexander Skinner has developed this view. Relocating the motivation to move against Rome from Constantine to the eastern curial elites themselves, he argues that with the new senate in Constantinople Constantine was seeking to satisfy the demands of an explicitly Hellenic audience unwilling to join the traditional senate in Rome.⁴

How does this align with my conclusions in [Chapter 1](#) about Constantine’s relationship with the senate of Rome after 324? There, where I canvassed evidence for collaboration between Constantine and the senate in Rome between 312 and 337, I argued that the foundation of Constantinople did not halt this mutually beneficial relationship between Constantine and the elites of Rome. I showed that, following a pattern established already in 312, Constantine used Roman senators to maintain his rule in the provinces formerly ruled by Licinius in the prefecture of the East (Oriens). This collaboration has not been taken into account in previous studies of Constantine’s regime-building policies after 324, and the evidence needs to be reviewed in this light.

In the present chapter I reconsider the position of Roman senators in the administrative and social hierarchy of Constantine’s eastern empire. The first section revisits conventional arguments about the place of the eastern elites in Constantine’s eastern empire-building scheme. I focus on a passage in Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini* that is conventionally used to demonstrate the widespread recruitment of senators in the East, but which in fact describes the grant of equestrian

³ Quotations from Heather (1994) 16, and Heather (1998) 186 respectively. Similarly e.g. in Kelly (2012) 196–200; Potter (2004) 388–91; Sarris (2002) 24.

⁴ Skinner (2008) 147–8, (2000).

honours. I then contextualize Eusebius' report with the contemporary numismatic record, which advertised the attractiveness of equestrian rank. I show that Eusebius' account and the numismatic record are in accord with the prosopographical records analysed in [Chapter 1](#), which suggested that senatorial office in Constantine's eastern administration remained the privilege of established Roman senators: Constantine's new eastern supporters were rewarded with equestrian rather than senatorial honours. The second section then reviews the evidence for the foundation of a second senate in Constantinople. By re-examining a brief passage from the *Origo Constantini* and a speech of Libanius, as well as arguments for the existence of Constantinian praetorships in Constantinople, it concludes that there is no reliable evidence for the establishment of a 'senate' in Constantinople under Constantine. In the third section I argue against the conventional view that Constantine's appointment policies in the East did not respect the traditional social hierarchy. In the provincial administration as well as in his new order of imperial companions, the *comites*, Roman senators ranked above (eastern) equestrians. A final section then offers evidence that Constantine's eastern Roman Empire was a consciously Roman Latin one. In sum, this chapter calls for a more nuanced understanding of the position of the traditional elites in Constantine's rule in the East. It argues that, rather than bolstering his position with the help of new elites, Constantine maintained his hold on the eastern provinces through a system of government that was based on respect for the traditional social hierarchy of the empire, both in the provinces and in Constantinople.

Recruiting Local Support in the East

A few days after his victory in 324, Constantine granted a general amnesty to Licinius' former supporters.⁵ This was the beginning of an extensive regime-building programme in the

⁵ Constantine's *clementia* legislation after the defeat of Licinius includes *CTh* 7.20.1, 15.14.1–2, with Corcoran (1996) 197–8, 274–6.

East. It is generally believed that, as part of his charm offensive to the eastern curial elites, Constantine made many of them senators. Three ancient historians, Constantine's contemporary Eusebius, the fourth-century historian Aurelius Victor, and the late fifth-century historian Zosimus (whose account, as discussed in the [previous chapter](#), is based on a source from the fourth century, the historian Eunapius) describe the widespread grant of favours by Constantine following his rise to sole rule in 324. Zosimus, who is generally hostile to Constantine, denounces the emperor's excessive generosity, which is said to have wasted imperial revenue, claiming that 'Constantine continuously squandered funds by unnecessary gifts to unworthy people.'⁶ Similar criticism is voiced by Aurelius Victor, whose *Liber De Caesaribus* provides a short history of the Roman Empire from Augustus to Constantius II. He criticizes Constantine for appointing unworthy individuals to public offices.⁷

Constantine's biographer Eusebius offers a more detailed and less critical view of Constantine's generosity. In the opening of book 4, the *Vita Constantini* lists a number of measures Constantine employed to rally support for his rule in the latter part of his reign. These included, so Eusebius reports, distributing money and goods as well as conferring various titles, honours and offices, which are recounted in hierarchical order (Eus. *V. Const.* 4.1.1–2). The first part of this list reads as follows:

On the one hand he showed general fatherly concern for all, while on the other he would honour each of those known to him with special promotions, bestowing everything on everyone with generosity of heart. One who sought favour from the emperor could not fail to obtain his request, nor was anyone who hoped for generous treatment disappointed in his expectations. Some received money in abundance, others goods; some acquired posts as praetorian prefects, others senatorial rank, others that of consuls, very many were designated governors. (After Cameron/Hall trans.)⁸

⁶ Zos. 2.38.1, 39.1.

⁷ Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.20–1.

⁸ Eus. *V. Const.* 4.1.1–2: ὧδε μὲν κοινὴν πρὸς ἅπαντας ἐνδεικνύμενος πατρικὴν κηδεμονίαν, ὧδε δὲ τῶν αὐτῶ γινωριζομένων ἕκαστον διαφόροις τιμῶν ἀξιώμασι, πάντα τε τοῖς πᾶσι μεγαλοψύχῳ δianoίᾳ δωρούμενος, οὐδ' ἦν σκοποῦ διαμαρτεῖν τὸν παρὰ βασιλείως χάριν

The honours recounted here look very traditional, as do the number of appointments: the most prestigious posts seem to have been the (praetorian) prefectures, probably both because these prefects exercised wide-ranging authority and because there were so few of them.⁹ Just below the praetorian prefecture, Eusebius lists the conferment of senatorial rank, ahead of the rank of consul, perhaps reflecting the rarity with which senatorial rank was conferred on non-senatorial supporters of Constantine. Further, many men were made provincial governors, a claim that looks convincing, given the large number of such provincial governorships in the empire, both senatorial and equestrian (Eusebius does not differentiate here, so he may be alluding to both).

The second part of Eusebius' catalogue has received more attention. I cite it in full in Greek, alongside a recent English translation of Eusebius' *Life of Constantine* by Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall:

κομήτων δ' οἱ μὲν πρώτου τάγματος ἤξιοῦντο, οἱ δὲ δευτέρου, οἱ δὲ τρίτου, διασημοτάτων θ' ὠσαύτως καὶ ἑτέρων πλείστων ἄλλων ἀξιωματῶν μυρίοι ἄλλοι μετέχον· εἰς γὰρ τὸ πλείονας τιμᾶν διαφόρους ἐπενόει βασιλεὺς ἄξιας.

Some were appointed *comites* of the first order, others of the second, others of the third. Similarly, many thousands shared the honours as *clarissimi* or a wide range of other titles; for in order to promote more persons the Emperor contrived different distinctions.

Cameron and Hall translate διασημότητος in the passage as *clarissimus*, which denotes senatorial rank.¹⁰ A more recent German translation of the *Vita Constantini* by Horst Schneider offers the same translation,¹¹ as does Marie-Joseph Rondeau in his French translation from 2013.¹² In line with such translations

αἰτοῦντα, οὐδέ τις ἐλπίσας ἀγαθῶν τυχεῖν τοῦ προσδοκηθέντος ἡστόχησεν, ἀλλ'οἱ μὲν χρημάτων, οἱ δὲ κτημάτων περιουσίας ἐτύγχανον, ἄλλοι ὑπαρχικῶν ἀξιωματῶν, οἱ δὲ συγκλήτου τιμῆς, οἱ δὲ τῆς τῶν ὑπάτων, πλείους δ' ἡγεμόνες ἐχρημάτιζον.

⁹ On the praetorian prefects under Constantine, see Roux (2014) 79–96; Kelly (2012) 186–8 with further refs; Porena (2004), (2003).

¹⁰ Cameron and Hall (1999) 154, 310.

¹¹ Bleckmann and Schneider (2007) 412–13.

¹² Pietri and Rondeau (2013) 459. Franco (2009) seems to miss the technical point entirely; it is also not discussed in Hermann-Otto (2001) 88, who translates the term as 'erlaucht' without further explanation of its meaning.

of these last sentences, Peter Heather has concluded that in this passage Eusebius is describing a large-scale recruitment of new senatorial supporters in the East. They were recruited, Heather suggests, for a new senate in Constantinople: ‘Eusebius invites us to place the creation of the senate of Constantinople in precisely this context, reporting that “the emperor devised many new tokens of his favour to a large number of people”.’¹³

Yet these translations are incorrect. The term διασημότατος does not designate senatorial rank but is rather, in early fourth-century Greek, the standard translation of the Latin *perfectissimus*.¹⁴ A correct translation of the passage is given by Claude Lepelley: ‘certains étaient jugés dignes de devenir comtes, soit du premier ordre, soit du deuxième, soit du troisième et, de la même manière, de devenir perfectissimes; des milliers d’autres avaient part aux autres dignités, les plus nombreuses’.¹⁵ However, Lepelley seems to favour breaking the sentence before the phrase θ’ ὡσαύτως, which is problematic: it appears more natural to let the new sentence begin with the διασημοτάτων. An accurate translation of the crucial two sentences in question would be as follows: ‘Some were appointed *comites* of the first order, others of the second, others of the third; many thousands were similarly appointed *perfectissimi* or a wide range of other titles’.

Eusebius is therefore not describing the widespread conferment of senatorial rank in the East. According to his account, only a few were honoured with senatorial rank or honours. The bulk of Constantine’s beneficiaries were awarded perfectissimate rank, or honours below the perfectissimate that Eusebius did not deem important enough to enumerate.¹⁶ Moreover, Eusebius explains that special promotions were only granted to individuals who were personally known to Constantine (as in the case of the Roman aristocrats who had met the emperor on several occasions in Rome and at court). Eusebius’ appraisal is thus not evidence for the recruitment of

¹³ Heather (1998) 186.

¹⁴ Lepelley (1999) 637–68; Guiland (1976) 18, 21; Hirschfeld (1913) 655.

¹⁵ Lepelley (1999) 637.

¹⁶ Lepelley (1999) 638.

Constantine's Eastern Roman Empire



FIGURE 2.1 Gold medallion, (a) obverse depicting Constantine with a laureate crown, (b) reverse a Roman knight with the legend *EQVIS ROMANVS*. 1867,0101.901.

© The Trustees of the British Museum.

a new senatorial class. On the contrary: Eusebius' account of Constantine's generous grant of honours and titles reveals that, while the emperor awarded perfectissime or lower honours to the great majority of his supporters, special appointments and senatorial rank in particular were accorded only sparingly.

Eusebius' account aligns neatly with contemporary numismatic evidence, which suggests that Constantine's eastern empire-building scheme targeted potential equestrian supporters, rather than senatorial ones. A series of gold medallions issued by the imperial court in the eastern provinces during Constantine's vicennial year in 325–6 is particularly interesting in this context. Constantine launched his *vicennalia* with public celebrations and banquets in the imperial palace in Nicomedia, where, amongst other coinage, he issued a gold medallion worth 1.5 solidi, consisting of 6.73g of pure gold (Figure 2.1). On its reverse it depicts a riding equestrian figure who is described as *EQVIS (sic)* or *EQVES ROMANVS* (Figure 2.1b).¹⁷ A further coin, somewhat lighter, glorifies the *SENATVS* (Figure 2.2).¹⁸

¹⁷ *RIC* VII Nicomedia 99, 100.

¹⁸ *RIC* VII Nicomedia 102.

A Unified Roman Empire (AD 312–337)



FIGURE 2.2 Solidus minted in Nicomedia, (a) obverse showing Constantine with a diadem, (b) reverse a toga-clad figure with the legend *SENATVS*. MK RO 26277.

By permission of the KHM, Wien.

At first sight, it might appear that the two coins were distributed together during the *vicennalia* in Nicomedia in the summer of 325, but there are difficulties: a valuable *EQVES/EQVIS ROMANVS* medallion paired with a simple *SENATVS* solidus would reverse the social hierarchy between the two classes, which would have been an affront to the senatorial order.¹⁹ However, this discrepancy in the weight can be easily explained, as H. V. Sutherland pointed out: the *SENATVS* coin will not have been part of the initial series, but was issued later.²⁰ He infers this first from the lower weight of the *SENATVS* coin and, more importantly, from the fact that Constantine is shown with a diadem, whereas he is still wearing a laureate crown on the *EQVES/EQVIS ROMANVS* medallion. What is more, in the *SENATVS* solidus only the head of Constantine is depicted, as on the *SENATVS* medallions in Rome, without his cuirassed shoulders, as on the *EQVES/EQVIS ROMANVS* medallion from Nicomedia. The *EQVES/EQVIS ROMANVS* medallion from Nicomedia will hence have been minted ahead of the vicennialian coinage series which shows Constantine without cuirassed shoulders but with a diademed head looking

¹⁹ *RIC* VII: 592–3.

²⁰ *RIC* VII: 592–3.

upwards.²¹ The *SENATVS* solidus of Nicomedia, with its diademed head, will have appeared somewhat later, as part of the empire-wide series.

This hypothesis is supported by additional evidence on the repartitioning of social ranks in this vicennialian series, notably from Thessalonica, which produced coinage with the same pair of motifs. Constantine spent the winter of 326/7 in Thessalonica prior to his war against the Goths in 327.²² The numismatic record of the city's mints suggests that there he distributed *SENATVS* medallions as well as two sets of *EQVES/EQVIS ROMANVS* medallions, at a ratio of 3 solidi to 2/1½ solidi respectively.²³ That is, the mint issue of Thessalonica aligned the coin weights with the social hierarchy of the two ranks, placing the senators above the *equites*. The coinage from Thessalonica hence suggests that no affront to the senatorial order was intended in this series.

But when was the *SENATVS* motif introduced in Nicomedia? The motif was issued for the first time perhaps in Thessalonica in early 326 to coincide with the beginning of Constantine's consular year.²⁴ It was also distributed at the vicennialian celebrations in Rome in July/August of that year, where it was part of a special group of emission celebrating the senate and people of Rome.²⁵ Coins with the motif were perhaps issued at the same time during festivities in Nicomedia too, but given Constantine's absence the Nicomedian *SENATVS* coin was issued as a simple solidus since medallions were distributed at special occasions only when the emperor was present.

The coinage that Constantine minted in Nicomedia in the summer of 325 to celebrate the twentieth imperial anniversary will thus have consisted only of *EQVES/EQVIS ROMANVS* medallions; there were no *SENATVS* solidi until the following year. That is, the precious coins distributed to his high officials

²¹ Diademed head: *RIC* VII Thessalonica 145 discussed below; *RIC* VII Rome 272, 276 (Chapter 1, pp. 16–18); *RIC* Nicomedia 102.

²² *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 41.13, 18 with Barnes (1982) 77.

²³ *RIC* VII Thessalonica 145–6 and *MEFR* 1975, 428 no. 8 for the 1½ solidus *EQVIS* medallion.

²⁴ *RIC* VII: 490.

²⁵ *RIC* VII Rome 272, discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 16–18.

on earlier occasion honoured only the equestrian order. What is more, the equestrian motif was distributed only, and intentionally, in the East, in Nicomedia and later Thessalonica.²⁶ Why? Its purpose, I propose, was to publicize the equestrian honours and to persuade potential provincial supporters in the East to seek equestrian posts or titles, in analogy to Rome, where only the *SENATVS* medallions were distributed to rally his Roman supporters: no examples of *EQVES/EQVIS ROMANVS* coins from Rome have been found.²⁷

My suggestion then is that, with this equestrian motif, Constantine was seeking to entice local elites with the promise of equestrian rank, just as he used the *SENATVS* medallions to rally Roman senatorial support in Rome. But how attractive was his offer? On the face of it, these equestrian posts seem a far less appealing distinction than senatorial rank. Eusebius mentions them at the bottom of his list of imperial grants, after the more prestigious ranks and titles. Equestrian governorships were certainly less attractive than senatorial offices: we may recall that some senatorial posts were newly created out of two equestrian governorships, such as that of Valerius Proculus, who was *consularis* in Europa and Thrace (as discussed in [Chapter 1](#)). The senatorial offices were more distinguished also because there were fewer of them, and because, while many Roman governors were appellate judges, the judgements passed by the far more numerous equestrian governors could be challenged in the courts of the highest (senatorial) magistrates.²⁸

Yet this is to view things from a Roman senatorial perspective. To a member of the municipal elite, in contrast, perfectissimate rank would have been a highly attractive honour under Constantine,²⁹ since he raised its status within

²⁶ A law of 324 suggests that there were still *Equites Romani* in Rome, who had to prove their honour to the prefect or the *uigiles*, *CTh* 2.17.1, yet these were not addressed by coinage in 324. On the peculiar survival of the *Equites Romani* in the city of Rome, see usefully Lepelley (1999) 639–41.

²⁷ *RIC* VII: 326–7.

²⁸ Judicial rights: *CTh* 1.16.6 (331), *CTh* 11.30.22 (343).

²⁹ On the equestrian order in the fourth century, see also Davenport (2018), to which the following discussion is much indebted; Potter (2004) 396–7; Frakes (2001) 65–6; Roman (2001) 458–63; Guiland (1976a).

the equestrian order to the detriment of other equestrian ranks, including that of *egregius*, which had hitherto been a mark of distinction among the local elites.³⁰ Under Constantine, men of perfectissimate rank became part of what Kyle Harper has called the 'community of honour', in that Constantine's social legislation on marriage and inheritance grouped them together with senators, *virī clarissimi*, and some other high-ranking curial officials (*duumviri*, *quinquennialii*, *flamines* and *sacerdotes*).³¹ This explains why, as inscriptions reveal, leading *curiales* sought to attain the status of *perfectissimi*, in order to rank above the city's elites (*principales*).³² These were fortunate men, for conferment of the rank was restricted: in the Album of Timgad, a list of about 300 members of Timgad's ruling elite from the 360s, only two members of the *ordo* had managed to acquire perfectissimate rank.³³

In principle, only those *curiales* who had performed all their curial duties were admitted to the perfectissimate.³⁴ Yet, depending on how it had been acquired, the rank brought interesting privileges that could be transferred to sons and grandsons, even if, unlike senatorial rank, the perfectissimate title itself was not hereditary.³⁵ If gained through service in the imperial administration, this equestrian rank exempted

³⁰ The argument that in this reform Constantine abolished the *egregii*, as made e.g. by Horstkotte (2001), and Lepelley (1999) 633–44, has been called into question by Davenport (2015a).

³¹ *CTh* 4.6.3 = *CJ* 5.27.1 (336). 'Community of honour': Harper (2011) 424, whose proposals are discussed in detail in Davenport (2018).

³² *Principales* in municipal councils: *CTh* 12.1.4 (317). A contemporary example is *CIL* VI 1723 = *ILS* 1225, which records, in this order, the elites of Puetoli as *uirī perfectissimi et principales et splendissimus ordo et populus Puteolanorum*. A similar epigraphic find from Sparta records a *perfectissimus* (διοσημότατος) *prostates* of the city of Sparta who was also high priest of the emperors in 326/9: *AE* 1931, 6 = *SEG* 11 810, see Wienand (2017) 135–40 with further refs. Lendon (1997) discusses the intricacies of the politics of honour in detail.

³³ The classic study of the Album of Timgad is Chastagnol (1968a). Important interpretations have been proposed by Brown (2012) 24–5; Kelly (2014) 147–8; Horstkotte (2001) 153; Lepelley (1979–81).

³⁴ *CTh* 6.38.1 (317), 12.1.5 (317) with Horstkotte (2001) 154. These laws were issued by Licinius but retained by Constantine: Corcoran (1996) 110, 274–92, (1993), by his sons: *CTh* 12.1.29 (340), and by Valentinian and Valens: *CTh* 12.1.57, 58 (364); see also Chastagnol (1992) 238–9.

³⁵ Horstkotte (2001) 154–6; Guillard (1976) 26–7; Hirschfeld (1913) 653.

its holder from curial duties for life, following a reform under the Tetrarchy. *Curiales* sought to acquire titles of this rank even without service in the imperial administration, but Constantine ruled that, while they could keep their new rank, immunity was not granted in such cases.³⁶ This means that the fiscal privileges attached to the rank were limited to those men of perfectissimate rank who had gained it in the imperial service.

Did Constantine award these prestigious posts to eastern (curial) elites? Several equestrian officials of perfectissimate rank can be documented in the East under Constantine.³⁷ For example, three milestones from Helenopontus, a province on the southern coast of the Black Sea in Asia Minor that had been renamed in honour of Constantine's mother Helena,³⁸ record Flavius Julius Leontius as *u(ir) p(erfectissimus) praes(es) prouinc(iae) Helenop(onti)* in 333/5.³⁹ Aur(elius) Fab(ius) Faustinus set up a milestone as *u(ir) p(erfectissimus) praes(es) prouinc(iae)* in the province of Lycia between 333 and 337.⁴⁰ And Claudius Longinus set up a milestone in the province of Pontus as *u(ir) p(erfectissimus) p(raeses) p(rouinciae)*; the first lines of the inscription are missing, but it includes a reference to two Caesars, so the date must be before 337 and may fall within the reign of Constantine.⁴¹ There is also the *praeses Thebaidos* Valerius Victorinianus recorded in a Greek papyrus of 326: his title is given in Greek as ὁ διασημότετος ἡγεμῶν.⁴² While the records do not reveal whether these were men from the East rather than men of western origin, other

³⁶ *CTh* 6.35.1 = *CJ* 12.28.1 (314); *CTh* 6.35.4 (328): exemption from curial duties only after service in the imperial administration; *CTh* 6.22.1 (324) and also *CTh* 12.1.42 (issued by Constantius in 354): no immunity for honorary titles, see also Horstkotte (2001) 154. For the reforms of the privileges attached to perfectissimate rank, see Davenport (2018).

³⁷ Lists of provincial governors in Barnes (1981) 147–59; *PLRE* I: 1098–110.

³⁸ On the history of the province of Pontus in the fourth century: Mitchell (1993a) 158–63.

³⁹ *PLRE* I: 503 (Leontius 23).

⁴⁰ *PLRE* I: 328 (Faustinus 10).

⁴¹ *PLRE* I: 515 (Longinus 3).

⁴² *PLRE* I: 962 (Victorinianus). Appendix B lists a few more equestrian officials under Constantine, and also Barnes (1982). For later examples, see *PLRE* I: 858 (Flavius Strategius 5), *v.p. comes et praeses Thebaidos* in 349 or *PLRE* I: 608 (Fl. Quintilius Eros Monaxius), *v.p. praeses Cariae* in 351/4.

evidence of equestrian officials shows that many of them will have come from the curial elites of the East, who were able to acquire important privileges for themselves and their families by supporting Constantine's government.⁴³

To summarize, Constantine's empire-building policies in the East look traditional. Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* with its report of the large-scale conferment of perfectissimate titles aligns neatly with the numismatic record of 326. These sources suggest that there was no senatorial recruitment scheme in the East. Rather, Constantine's scheme targeted potential equestrians for the lower ranks in the administration. For curial elites, this rank granted great social prestige and important fiscal privileges and distinguished its holders in particular in their municipal contexts. However, it is not clear how far he was successful with this policy: the available sources do not indicate whether the equestrian officials who can be documented in this period were newly won eastern supporters or, like the Roman senators in the higher-ranking levels of the administration, men from the West.

A Constantinian Senate in Constantinople?

Conventional accounts of Constantine's eastern reign give a central position to the existence of a new senate in Constantinople. Imperial legislation and literary evidence from the later reign of Constantius II indicate that by the late 350s, some decades after Constantine, his city had indeed become the seat of a fully fledged second senate. Yet the situation under Constantine himself is much less clear. Unhelpfully, much of the information on Constantine's Constantinople and the state of its city council stems from historians and chroniclers working in the city in the fifth and sixth century, who set out to trace back to Constantine the institutions that made Constantinople the most important city in the East in their lifetime.⁴⁴ The senate

⁴³ On the local recruitment of equestrian governors in this period, see Davenport (2018) and Jones (1964) I: 44–5, 49, 741.

⁴⁴ E.g. Pont (2010); Van Dam (2010); Dagron (1974) 14–19.

was crucial to their undertaking: only a city with a senate on a par with Rome could claim to rank, by analogy with Rome in the West, as the capital of the eastern empire. This helps to explain why later sources, including Sozomen, the *Chronicon Paschale* and Philostorgios, are keen to attribute the foundation of a senate to Constantine;⁴⁵ to bolster their argument, Constantine is also said to have constructed houses for members of the Roman senate and other men of renown who followed him to his new city.⁴⁶

The contemporary evidence is sparse and much less straightforward. The senate is not mentioned by Eusebius, a contemporary of Constantine, or Aurelius Victor, who wrote under Constantius II, even though both authors provide details about Constantine's Constantinople. As a result, the most important text for this question is a panegyric account of Constantine's rise to sole power, the *Origo Constantini*. Nothing is known about its author, but from other evidence it is plausible to date the text to the mid- or late fourth century, possibly even to early in the reign of Constantius.⁴⁷

In a much-cited passage, the *Origo Constantini* states that 'there [i.e. in Constantinople], Constantine founded a senate of the second order and called them *clari*': *ibi senatum constituit secundi ordinis, claros uocauit*.⁴⁸ This passage is generally understood as evidence of Constantine's establishment of a senate in Constantinople from the outset, whose members had an inferior status (*clari*) to those of Rome and which was of restricted size, yet which was still, and perhaps intentionally, a potential rival to Rome: 'for all the controversy about the growth of the senate of Constantinople . . . , it seems to be clear that Constantine created the senate, a *synedrion* rather than a

⁴⁵ Soz. 2.3.6; 2.34.4; *Chron. Pasch.* 529, a. 330; Philost. 2.9; by contrast Zosimus, who is critical of Constantine, places the foundation of the senate in the reign of Julian: Zos. 3.11.3, probably with the aim of denigrating his predecessor on this key point, see Dagron (1974) 120.

⁴⁶ Soz. 2.3.4; Zos. 2.31.2; Hesych. *frag.* 4, see Dagron (1974) 122.

⁴⁷ On the *Origo Constantini*, ascribed to the Anonymous Valesianus, see König (1987) and Barnes (1987a).

⁴⁸ *Anon. Val.* 6.30.

boule, even if founded on a smaller scale than Rome's and with secondary status'.⁴⁹

Even though the *Origo Constantini* refers only to *clari*, it is often argued that the membership of the new institution also included *clarissimi*, men of senatorial rank. This view draws on a rhetorical passage in a later speech of Libanius, *Oration* 42 from the late 380s, which is thought to refer to men of senatorial rank in the council of Constantine's city. Scholars have also pointed to the etymological connection of *clari* and *clarissimi*, which, so it is argued, reveals that Constantine established the new councillors with the aim of granting them senatorial status in the future. This view was further supported by André Chastagnol's argument that Constantine introduced praetorships in Constantinople. By this measure, he argued, Constantine enabled these *clari* senators to become proper senators, that is *clarissimi*. His proposition attractively solves the problem of the assumed presence of men of senatorial rank in this body, and it has been taken up by several subsequent scholars.⁵⁰

Others have argued that the *clari* and *clarissimi* in Constantinople should be kept separate. Gilbert Dagron, who has offered the most detailed discussion of the development of the senate under Constantine, rightly highlighted a major obstacle to ascribing the foundation of a senate in Constantinople to Constantine, one that stems from Eusebius, a key source for his later reign. For taken together, as Dagron pointed out, Eusebius' references to the senate in Rome and the presence of senators at the burial of Constantine strongly suggest that under Constantine there was only one senate in the empire, and that the senators in Constantinople constituted a sort of representation or diplomatic mission, whether formal or informal, of the senate in Rome.⁵¹ Dagron

⁴⁹ Quotation from Grig and Kelly (2012) 12; see also Harries (2012) 122–4; Skinner (2008) 129, (2000) 369–70; Rebenich (2007) 179; Heather (1998) 184–6, (1994); Chastagnol (1992) 251–3, (1976). More cautious: Dagron (1974) 120–4 and Jones (1964) I: 132.

⁵⁰ Chastagnol (1992) 251–3, (1976) 346–7; Potter (2013) 266; Skinner (2008) 141–3; Heather (1998) 185.

⁵¹ Dagron (1974) 123 with reference to Eus. *V. Const.* 4.69.

proposed that there were two assemblies in Constantinople at the time. The city council, which for Dagron is the senate mentioned in the *Origo Constantini*, was ‘an exalted municipal council that was raised in status by Constantine’s presence, an “inferior” senate’; its members remained ‘modest senators’.⁵² This is supposed to have represented an ‘intermediate phase’, in which the members of the ancient city council could rise above the status of normal municipal councils.⁵³ However, this was not the institution where senators – for Dagron, these are the important senators in Constantine’s imperial entourage – assembled: rather, the latter constituted a ‘sub-branch’ of the senate of Rome. Dagron hence distinguishes the senators in Constantinople from the members of its council, which was no more than an elevated city council with special regulations raising it above normal municipal assemblies.⁵⁴

A detailed re-examination of the relevant passage in the *Origo* highlights the difficulties in using this text as evidence for a senate in Constantinople under Constantine. The terminology in the passage is not straightforward, and in fact allows various conclusions about the status of the senate of Constantinople under Constantine. I begin with its use of the Latin term *senatus*. This is conventionally taken to mean ‘senate’, as in the (imperial) senate of Rome, seat of the senatorial order. Yet this is not the only possible translation: *senatus* can also be used to denote a municipal council and was used as equivalent to *ordo* or *curia*.⁵⁵ This remains true in the period of Constantine: a law of Constantine II issued to the proconsul of Africa, Aurelius Celsinus, on 8 January 339 concerns the municipal council of Carthage. The council is here called *Karthaginis splendidissimae senatus*, but its members are *curiales*.⁵⁶ About six months later, Constans, in whose domain Carthage was located, sent a clarifying letter (contradicting

⁵² Dagron (1974) 192: ‘tout au plus . . . qu’une curie anoblie par la présence impériale, un sénat “inférieur”’, ‘les modestes sénateurs’.

⁵³ Dagron (1974) 120–4, 192. *Pace* Chastagnol (1992) 251; (1976) 348.

⁵⁴ A similar distinction is made by Errington (2006) 148.

⁵⁵ As noted already by Reid (1913) 440.

⁵⁶ *CTh* 12.1.27 (339).

his brother's ruling) to the council itself, which is addressed as *ordo Carthaginensium*.⁵⁷ This is also how the local *curia* in Carthage is described on inscriptions, where there is reference to the financial support of the city's *ordo splendidissimus*.⁵⁸

The citizen body of a municipal town was often described as *s(enatus) p(opulus)q(ue)* in public inscriptions in this period, as can be inferred from three dedications from Italy from around the same time. The civic institutions of the city of Tibur in the province of Flaminia et Picenum, awarding honours on *CIL XIV 3614 = ILS 1207*, are described as *s(enatus) p(opulus)q(ue) T(iburs)*, as those of Aletrium in the province of Campania on *CIL X 5803, 5805* from 293 to 305 are called *s(enatus) p(opulus)q(ue) A(letrinatorum)*. Most interesting for present purposes are two inscriptions from Trebula Baliniensis, also in Campania: on *CIL X 4559 (330–80)* the city's civic institutions are named as *senatus populusque Trebu(lanorum)*, while on a later dedication, *CIL X 4560 (370–400)*, they are called *ordo populusque Trebu(lan)orum*. Finally, an inscription from Amiternum, also in the province of Flaminia et Picenum, records the words of two municipal *sen(atores) principale(s)* to their urban council, suggesting that *senator*, too, is a complex term, in that it could be used to denote municipal councillors in the fourth century AD.⁵⁹ Together, these documents demonstrate that in contemporary Latin usage *senatus* could be used, in legal documents as well as on inscribed public records, as a synonym for a municipal *ordo* whose members were called *curiales*, and that *senatores* could also be found in municipal cities. The term *senatus* in the text of the *Origo* therefore need not refer to the imperial senate of Rome, or indeed to a municipal council of special status, but could simply denote the regular municipal council of a provincial city.

⁵⁷ *CTh* 12.1.41 (339).

⁵⁸ E.g. on *AE* 1975, 873.

⁵⁹ *AE* 1937, 119–20 = *LSA* 1788. For municipal *senatores* in the late republican era and the early empire, see the discussion in Reid (1913) 440 and the detailed study of the *lex Imitana* by Gonzáles and Crawford (1986), in particular p. 203 n. to line 39.

It is also unclear what the *Origo* has in mind when describing the *senatus* as *secundi ordinis*. In the light of the evidence we have just examined, the most natural interpretation of the Latin is to render it as ‘of the second rank (order)’, characterizing the council as belonging to the category of municipal councils, since councils on the municipal level were ‘of second rank’ beneath the senate in Rome.⁶⁰

Then there is the word *clarus*. *Clarus* is an adjective describing the quality of a person (or thing) as ‘shining’, ‘well-known’ or ‘famous’; unlike *clarissimus*, *clarus* is not a title or status.⁶¹ To a Latin speaker, a *clarus uir* would thus not be a person with the title of a particular rank, but simply a ‘famous’ or ‘celebrated’ person, irrespective of social status. This usage is found on a contemporary dedication, that of an honorary statue in Rome to the Roman senator and urban prefect Amnius Anicius Paulinus, who is praised for virtues for which he was privately and publicly famous: *quibus privatim ac publice clarus est*.⁶² Another example is a now lost honorary inscription on a marble base found in Puteoli in the province of Campania, dated to the second half of the fourth century.⁶³ Here, a certain Tannonius Crhysantius (sic), *uir perfectissimus* and patron (of the city), was honoured with an inscription because of his ever-increasing merits, which prompted the people and councillors to celebrate the name of Crhysantius with their voices and erect statues to him: *Tanno[ni] Crhysanti, u(iri) [p(erfectissimi)], patroni. Florentem meritis Crhysanti nomine famam patria concelebrant cuncti populique patresque uocibus claros titulis consignet honores*.⁶⁴ Together these *claros honores* constituted a series of honorary inscriptions, which were *claros* because they were public (one was specifically erected in a much frequented

⁶⁰ Note that Roman senators who lost their senatorial status, and thus affiliation to the senate, were sent back to their municipal councils to become normal municipal councillors. See the discussion in Chapter 6, p. 240 of the Fortunatus presented by Symmachus.

⁶¹ Lewis and Short Latin dictionary. Of things: see the *clara veste*, the distinguished robes of the senators meeting Constantine in 326 in Optatianus: Opt. *Carm.* 20a 12.

⁶² *CIL* VI 1683 (+ p. 4733); *PLRE* I: 679 (Paulinus 14).

⁶³ *CIL* X 1813 = *LSA* 1911 (U. Gehn), with further refs.

⁶⁴ *CIL* X 1813 = *LSA* 1911 (U. Gehn), *PLRE* I: 204 (Tannonius Chrysantius 2).

place), and hence shining and well-known.⁶⁵ Significantly, they are not an indication of rank: these *clari honores* are conferred on an individual of perfectissimate rank.

To return to the *Origo Constantini*, one possibility would thus be that the *Origo* provides no indication of the rank of the members of the council, but simply points out that Constantine called them 'famous' or 'brilliant' men. A second possibility is highlighted by Dagron who, arguing that this use of *clarus* could be an indication of rank, suggested that *clarus* is a translation of the Greek adjective λαμπρός, which was a common epithet for cities in the Greek East.⁶⁶ If so, then at the time of Constantine, the councillors of Constantinople would have been λαμπροί and the city itself a λαμπρά πόλις. However, this does not look convincing, because such a λαμπρά πόλις would have ranked below a λαμπρότατα πόλις such as Ancyra and its λαμπρότατα βουλή.⁶⁷ In view of Constantine's policies for the promotion of Constantinople, such a low rank for Constantinople and its municipal councillors is very unlikely. They would have held at least the rank of λαμπρότατοι in the hierarchy of cities.⁶⁸ The first possibility, that *clari* is used to show that Constantine held the members of this institution in high esteem (without indication of rank), is more likely.

To sum up: no interpretation of the *Origo Constantini* is without difficulties. All of the key elements are problematic, but overall the evidence points to an institution with the character and rank of a municipal council rather than a 'senate'. At any rate, the *Origo* cannot be taken as reliable evidence for the foundation of a new senate in Constantinople alongside Rome.

⁶⁵ *AE* 1946, 141 = *LSA* 54 (U. Gehn and C. Machado). See also *LSA* 1914 (= *CIL* X 1815) on Chrysantius' descendants.

⁶⁶ Dagron (1974) 123.

⁶⁷ Mitchell and French (2012) 287–8 no. 120; 290–1 no. 123; 294–6 no. 127. Some cities were both, such as, for instance, the Egyptian city of Oxyrhynchus, which was λάμπρα και λαμπροτάτη πόλις in 342 (*P. Oxy.* 14).

⁶⁸ This does not mean that λάμπρος, α, ον could not be used of Constantinople or other elevated cities in a broader, more general sense to mean 'illustrious' or 'shining' in analogy with *clarus, a, um*. Such a general usage can be found in e.g. *Chron. Pasch.* 529 a. 330, which refers to Constantinople as a πόλις μεγίστην, λαμπράν και εὐδαίμον; *Zos.* 2.38.3 describes future praetors at Rome as οἱ ἐν λαμπρᾷ τυχεῖ.

A second literary source has been used to support the idea that the councillors of Constantinople were senators and that Constantine planned to promote its (preliminary) senate to the same rank as Rome. This is a passage from an oration of the Antiochean orator Libanius (*Lib. Or.* 42). The speech was written c. 390 in defence of a young *curialis* Thalassius, whose request to be included in the senate of Constantinople had been refused on grounds of his alleged low social background and disreputable source of income. Libanius ridicules this decision by claiming, among other things, that in the past there had been several men of similar (financial and social) background who were very influential and powerful in the Constantinopolitan senate.⁶⁹ Libanius' portrayal of these important men is full of offensive exaggerations, and as some of the dignitaries denigrated in the speech were alive at its date of composition some scholars have questioned whether the speech was written with the general public in mind, pointing out that it is more likely that it was reserved for Libanius' close associates.⁷⁰ Even so, Libanius' evidence has been used repeatedly to gauge the origin of the first Constantinopolitan senators, so it is necessary to examine it in detail here. As I shall show, it is not an informative source on the early senate of Constantinople.

For a start, in Libanius' account there is no indication of the status of the senate of Constantinople under Constantine: it was a fully fledged senate at the time of his oration, but Libanius is silent about its nature in earlier decades. When he sets out to link famous men to the institution that, in his time, had become the senate of Constantinople, he is interested in continuity, not institutional status. Hence, discussing examples from the time of Constantine, he refers to the council once as a *συνέδριον* and once as a *βουλευτήριον*.⁷¹ The logic of Libanius' argument implies that he is thinking of the same assembly, but his terminology is not straightforward in this respect. Moreover, his point is not that the status of the institution has

⁶⁹ Several later lists enumerating alleged members of the senate of Constantinople have survived, yet these are of legendary character, see Dagron (1974) 122 n. 1.

⁷⁰ Errington (2006) 158; Norman (2000) 147–8.

⁷¹ *Lib. Or.* 42.23.

remained the same, but that the present senate traces its history back to this earlier assembly. Indeed, a non-clarissimate status for the institution and its members under Constantine would even emphasize his point about the low background of some of the first members of the body, a suggestion Libanius seems to make in an earlier passage of the speech.⁷²

As regards men of influence in the council of Constantinople under Constantine, Libanius provides two names. The first is an otherwise unknown Tychamenes, a native of Crete and 'overseer of works', ὁ τῶν ἔργων ἐπιστάτης, who is known to have had great influence in the senate, ὅσον ἦν Τυχαμένης ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ. Tychamenes' position cannot be identified, so it is possible, as has been proposed, that he was responsible for the construction works in Constantinople, where he will therefore have been resident.⁷³ The second individual who, according to Libanius, had great influence on the municipal councillors of Constantinople is the powerful praetorian prefect under Constantine, Flavius Ablabius, also a native of Crete.⁷⁴ In a highly rhetorical passage, Libanius claims that the other councillors treated him with exaggerated flattery and that he was 'like a god' among them, ὁπότε εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον εἰσίοι, θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἦν.⁷⁵

This passage has been used to argue that Ablabius was one of the first senatorial members of a second senate in Constantinople.⁷⁶ Yet this view must be rejected. Ablabius' membership even in the city council of Constantinople is

⁷² Lib. *Or.* 42.22. The grammar of this passage is, however, problematic.

⁷³ *PLRE* I: 927 (Tychamenes).

⁷⁴ *PLRE* I: 3 (Ablabius 4) with Porena (2006) 354–6, (2003) 409–15; Feissel (1999) 264–6; Corcoran (1996) 329–30; Migl (1994) 45–6; Barnes (1982) 142.

⁷⁵ Lib. *Or.* 42.23. Rhetorical: a similar passage in Julian's *Or.* 1 to Constantius is of particular interest in this context: Julian holds that, given his largess towards them, Constantine's soldiers continued to worship him as though he were a god even after his death, ὡσθ' οἱ μὲν στρατευόμενοι τῆς περὶ τὰς δωρεάς καὶ τὰς χάριτας μεγαλοψυχίας ἔτι μνημόνοι καθάπερ θεὸν διατελοῦσι σεβόμενοι, Jul. *Or.* 1.8a–b. This parallel suggests that the exaggerated treatment of generous or influential men was a well-known topos used to denounce both the object of such adulation and the adulators themselves.

⁷⁶ E.g. Salzman (2016) 40: 'of senatorial rank but not a member of Rome's senate'; Skinner (2008) 134–6; Kuhoff (1982) 277; Chastagnol (1992) 249, (1976) 348; Dagron (1974) 122 n. 1; Petit (1957) 348, 380.

problematic, because he was of senatorial rank by 328 at the latest. From then on, as senator he was by law exempted from membership in municipal councils and its burdens. He thus belonged to a different (tax) class, and was nominally a citizen of Rome, even if permanently resident in the provinces.⁷⁷ In addition, even if we are to suppose that it was possible for a senator to be a member of the council in Constantinople, in the case of Ablabius a chronological problem presents itself. Since Ablabius was awarded senatorial status in 328 at the latest, when he was appointed praetorian prefect, in order to uphold the argument that Ablabius was a member in the Constantinopolitan council, André Chastagnol was forced to propose that this new senate was founded already in 328, two years ahead of the inauguration of Constantinople in 330.⁷⁸

This does not look convincing. A close reading of Libanius' passage reveals that he does not firmly establish Ablabius' or Tychamenes' membership in the senate. Libanius holds that Ablabius at times visited the senate and that he had great influence on its membership, a claim that can easily be explained with reference to Ablabius' position at the time. As Constantine's praetorian prefect at court for some years after the city's inauguration in 330, Ablabius was extremely powerful and wielded great influence at court: in addition to being Constantine's prefect and adviser to Constantine's son Constantius from 335 onwards, his daughter Olympias was betrothed to Constans.⁷⁹ Thus no membership of the senate is necessary to explain why the councillors should treat Ablabius 'like a god' when he visited their chamber to discuss official business (such as the promotion of Constantinople). The same could be said of Constantine's master of works Tychamenes, if he was indeed senatorial, since he will also have been close to the emperor and since he, as main architect of Constantine's building programme, also had business to discuss with the municipal council in Constantinople.

⁷⁷ On the privileges and burdens of senatorial rank, see now Moser (2016b), esp. pp. 438–45.

⁷⁸ Chastagnol (1992) 249.

⁷⁹ Advisor: *PLRE* I: 3 (Ablabius 4). Marriage: Amm. 20.11.3; Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 69 and Barnes (2011) 165, 172.

Further evidence from Libanius confirms that neither Ablabius nor Tychamenes need have been a member of the city council in order to exert great influence there: Flavius Dionysius, a Sicilian of senatorial rank who had been governor of Phoenicia in 328–9 and *consularis Syriae* sometime between 329 and 335, is also characterized by Libanius as a man with great influence in Constantinople in 341.⁸⁰ Libanius explains that he was known for his successes in the courts and his reputation in office; indeed, Libanius adds critically, Dionysius could do away with anyone who stood in his way, so officials were well advised to befriend him.⁸¹ Dionysius' powerful influence in Libanius' Constantinople is again easily explained: it stemmed from his intimacy with the court of Constantine. Dionysius had been granted the rank of *comes consistoriarum* at an unknown date prior to 335, and was accordingly allowed, and expected, to participate in the imperial *consistorium*. In order to do so, he bought a house in Constantinople (where he was admired for his generous hospitality) and exercised influence among its leading councillors.⁸² The three men commonly believed to have been senators in Constantine's Constantinople thus yielded great influence there merely because of their close relationship with the emperor.⁸³

Tychamenes, Ablabius and Dionysius were powerful in their own right; all three were resident in Constantinople because of their employment there. The fact that they interacted with local municipal councillors does not mean that they derived their status or power from the municipal council, nor even that they lent it any of their glamour. Indeed, this is Libanius' whole point, when he chides the exaggerated respect with which

⁸⁰ *PLRE* I: 259 (Dionysius 11) and Barnes (1982) 153–4 and my [Appendix B](#). On the *comes* Dionysius and Libanius, see also Schlange-Schöningh (1995) 94 n. 10.

⁸¹ *Lib. Or.* 1.36.

⁸² Hospitality: *Lib. Or.* 1.36.

⁸³ Note the parallel between Libanius' description of Dionysius' overriding authority in Constantinople and that of the *comes* of Constantius Datanus, who in the mid-350s assisted Libanius in his attempt to settle in Antioch: like Dionysius, Datanus, who is introduced as a man with influence at court, 'could succeed in everything he undertook', *Lib. Or.* 1.94. The parallel is pointed out by Martin and Petit (1979) 113 n. 1.

Ablabius was treated by the urban councillors. Libanius' words imply a real gap between this eminent figure and the local elites on the council, a claim that increases the force of his argument that earlier generations of councillors in Constantinople had flattered men whose wealth stemmed from sources of income similar to those now considered discreditable and unsuitable in Libanius' protégé Thalassius.

One question remains: can Ablabius, as has repeatedly been argued, be considered a new eastern supporter of Constantine?⁸⁴ The case is complicated. Ablabius had started his career in Crete. The diocese of Moesia, which included central Greece and Crete, had fallen to Constantine in 317, so Ablabius had served under Constantine for eight years during the conflict with Licinius.⁸⁵ During this period he may have been *vicarius Italiae* under Constantine in 319.⁸⁶ It would therefore be misleading to list Ablabius among the new 'eastern' supporters in the context of Constantine's victory over Licinius and its aftermath: at Chrysopolis, Ablabius was on the side of the western emperor.⁸⁷ In the eyes of Constantine's newly conquered eastern subjects, Ablabius will have been a representative of the West when he acted as *vicarius* in Asiana from 324/5 to around 328. However, Ablabius was a Greek who spoke Greek, so he may not have looked as foreign to the eastern population as a senator from Rome such as the Sicilian Flavius Dionysius.⁸⁸ Tychamenes' situation was similar to that of Ablabius: also born in Crete, he will have been a native Greek speaker. Indeed, their familiarity with the Greek language may be an additional reason for their influence in the council of Constantinople. The state of the sources does not

⁸⁴ Skinner (2008) 146; Kuhoff (1982) 277.

⁸⁵ Anon. Val. 5.18. That Crete was part of the western administration before 324 is also noted by Skinner (2008) 134.

⁸⁶ Corcoran (1996) 310, (1993) 105 n. 44; *Contra*: Porena (2014) 264–5, who argues for 315 and ranks Ablabius among the earliest supporters of Constantine in the conflict with Licinius from 315 onwards.

⁸⁷ Porena (2014) 269.

⁸⁸ Dionysius was thus not an 'easterner' as assumed e.g. by Kuhoff (1982) 277. Indeed, Dionysius may have been related to the Roman senator L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius 12, PVR in 301–2, *praeses Syriae Coeles, iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis* in the late third century (see my discussion in [Chapter 1](#), p. 22).

allow secure conclusions about the status of the city council of Constantinople or its membership under Constantine, but it is significant that all three men said by Libanius to have wielded influence in the urban council in Constantine's Constantinople can be considered men from the West; they were not new eastern supporters rallying to Constantine's cause following the defeat of Licinius.

A final point is made by proponents of the view that Constantine founded a preliminary second senate in Constantinople, namely that he introduced praetorships to the city. This argument was first proposed by André Chastagnol. Based on his interpretation of two entries in the late antique legal codes on the role of the praetors in safeguarding the legal position of minors, *CTh* 3.32.2 and *CJ* 7.62.17, Chastagnol argued in 1976 that Constantine had introduced two praetors in his new city between 330 and 337; furthermore, he claimed that through these praetorships the new senators in Constantinople 'were granted the same status as those in Rome'.⁸⁹ This reading – that Constantine introduced praetors who gave games in Constantinople – has been taken up by several subsequent historians.⁹⁰

However, Chastagnol's complex argument does not hold up to scrutiny. It runs as follows: the text of both rulings are very similar, yet there are differences that imply that one was dealing with matters in Rome and the other with Constantinople. Hence the shorter ruling, *CJ* 7.62.17, which was sent to the urban prefect of Rome, Julianus, concerned Rome. This Chastagnol infers from the fact that there is a reference in the law to the right to appeal to the urban prefect. By contrast, he argued, the much longer ruling preserved as *CTh* 3.32.2, which does not mention the urban prefect, concerned Constantinople. This is inferred from the fact that in the earlier part of the ruling there is a reference to a *Const[antiniano] praetore*. A praetor of this name is not known to have existed in Rome but can be documented in Constantinople in 340 (*CTh* 6.4.5, 6).

⁸⁹ Chastagnol (1992) 251–3, (1976) 346–7.

⁹⁰ Potter (2013) 266; Skinner (2008) 141–3; more guarded: Heather (1998) 185.

Table 2.1: *Legal evidence for a Constantinian praetor*

<p><i>CTh</i> 3.32.2 <i>IMPP.</i> (vacat). <i>Etsi minores uel ex patris nomine uel ex [suo, de]bitis dumtaxat fiscalibus ingruentibus, uel ex priuatis co[ntracti]bus repperientur obnoxii, decreti interposito a Const[antiniano] praetore celebranda est, probatis examussim causis, [ut pate]facta rerum fide firma uenditio perseueret. Haec cum [ita sint,] etiam suspecti tutores sub eius debent examine postul[ari, contraria] quoque actione tribuenda; scilicet ut tunc demum ad exp[erenti]am tuam seruatis legibus recurratur, si apud utrumque p[raeto]rem, dum quaestio uentilatur, ab aliqua parte auxilium [pro] uocationis fuerit obiectum, ut prouocationis merita [subli]mis disceptator expendas.</i></p>	<p><i>CJ</i> 5.71.18 <i>Constantinus A. et Constantius C. ad Severum.</i> <i>Si minores uel ex patris nomine uel ex suo, debitis dumtaxat fiscalibus ingruentibus, uel ex priuatis contractibus reperiantur obnoxii, decreti interpositio a Constantiniano praetore celebranda est, probatis examussim causis, ut patefacta rerum fide firma uenditio perseueret.</i> <i>D. XV K. IAN. SERDICAE PROBIANO ET IULIANO CONSS.</i> (322) <i>CJ</i> 7.62.17 <i>Idem A. ad Iulianum PV.</i> <i>Si apud utrumque praetorem, dum quaestio uentilatur, ab aliqua parte auxilium prouocationis fuerit obiectum, praefecturae urbis iudicium sacrum appellator obseruet.</i></p>
--	---

Note: The Latin text of the *CJ* is taken from Krüger (1877a).

Chastagnol's reconstruction is problematic on two counts. First, it discards a third piece of evidence, namely the short text preserved as *CJ* 5.71.18. This entry of the *Codex Justinianus* in fact contains the first part of the longer ruling (*CTh* 3.32.2), including the reference to a Constantinian praetor, which suggests that the original ruling, *CTh* 3.32.2, was broken into two entries by the compilers of the *Codex Justinianus*: *CJ* 5.71.18, which preserves the first lines on the role of the Constantinian praetor; and *CJ* 7.62.17, which contains the concluding sentences on the appeals procedures. This original ruling therefore contained a reference both to the urban prefect and to a Constantinian praetor (Table 2.1).

The law's content might be more fruitfully understood if it was possible to establish the addressee and date of the ruling. Unhelpfully, the evidence allows divergent interpretations on both. *CJ* 7.62.17 contains a reference to the addressee, the urban prefect Julianus. Under Constantine, a certain Amnius Anicius Julianus was urban prefect of Rome from 326 to 329, and would be a likely addressee of such a law. However, *CJ* 7.62.17's parallel law, *CJ* 5.71.18, comes with a full dating: according to the subscription, the law was sent to a certain Severus in the consular year of Probianus and Julianus in 322. The identity of this Severus is not specified, but a Severus was vicar of Italy at the time, Julius Severus, who is known to have held this office in 318 and who received laws with very similar content.⁹¹ If so, this Severus may be identical with the vicar of Italy Julius Severus;⁹² he could still have been in office in 322, when the law was issued.⁹³ Hence, it is likely that this law was sent to Severus as vicar of Italy.

An alternative date, 326, and an alternative addressee was suggested by Otto Seeck, a proposal that has been retained by Judith Evans-Grubbs.⁹⁴ They both argued that the information in *CJ* 5.71.18 should be discarded in favour of that provided by *CJ* 7.62.17, and that *CTh* 3.32.2 was issued in 326 to the urban prefect Julianus.⁹⁵ Their suggestion looks attractive, because it is likely that a law regulating Roman praetorships would have been sent to the urban prefect. Nonetheless, the evidence allows another conclusion, which would again ascribe the law to Severus: it is possible that the

⁹¹ *Vicarius* rather than praetorian prefect: Barnes (1982) 130. *CTh* 3.32.1 on the alienation of property of minors and *CTh* 8.18.2 on the transfer of property from maternal succession; *PLRE* I: 836 (Severus 25).

⁹² For the identification of the *vicarius* Severus from 322 with Julius Severus, *vicarius* of Italy, see also Barnes (1982) 130. This Julius Severus may, in turn, be identical to Julius Verus, equestrian *praeses* of Tarraconensis *PLRE* I: 953 (Verus 3).

⁹³ Given the similarities in subscription, addressee and content, it has been suggested that the subscriptions of *CJ* 5.71.18 were copied from *CTh* 3.32.1: Krüger (1877a) 501 (*CJ* 5.71.18), but see Krüger (1877b) 236 n. 4.

⁹⁴ Evans-Grubbs (1995) 346.

⁹⁵ *Contra*: Krüger (1877a) 698 (*CJ* 7.62.17), who, however, does not discuss the identity of Julianus.

compilers of *CJ* 7.62.17 mistakenly took the addressee to be an urban prefect by the name of Julianus, when in fact this was the name of the consul in whose term of office the ruling was given (in 322).

So far I have examined two reconstructions of the ruling contained in the three sources *CTh* 3.32.2, *CJ* 7.62.17 and *CJ* 5.71.18; one reconstruction dates the law to 322 and the other to 326, while both read it as concerning the situation in Rome. There is also a third possibility: in view of the presence of both an urban prefect and a *praetor Constantinianus*, Paul Krüger's second edition of the Justinianic Code proposed to date the three passages after the introduction of the urban prefect in Constantinople in 359, as he believed that a *praetor Constantinianus* existed only in Constantinople and not Rome.⁹⁶ Krüger also pointed out that what remains of the introductory inscription of *CTh* 3.32.2 is *IMPP*, which suggests that the law was issued by two emperors, and that it must therefore post-date Constantine.

Given that Constantinople was not administered by an urban prefect prior to 359, there are two possibilities. First, if the law was issued under Constantine or at any time before 359, it must concern the situation in Rome, in which case a Constantinian praetor must have existed there. The law issued in 322 to the *vicarius* Severus, or in 326 to the urban prefect Julianus, would then concern the situation in Rome; alternatively, given the indication that *CTh* 3.32.2 was issued by two emperors, the regulation could also date to the 340s in the joint reign of Constans and Constantius II, and again be regulating matters in Rome. Second, if, as suggested by Chastagnol, the ruling relates to Constantinople, it must postdate the introduction of the urban prefect there in 359 and so also postdate the reign of Constantine. Hence ultimately *CTh* 3.32.2 does not document a Constantinian praetor in Constantinople under Constantine, but points instead to the possibility that such a praetorship was introduced in Rome during his reign.

⁹⁶ Krüger (1877b) 236.

A New Imperial Hierarchy? The *Comites*

Let us now consider more closely the reformed order of imperial *comites*. This institution has been identified, along with the senate, as one of the means Constantine supposedly used to generate a new ruling elite, and it is believed that Constantinian *comitiva* were also intended to undermine existing social ranks.⁹⁷ I begin with a brief outline of the institution, and then examine the individuals known to have been awarded such honours. This will then provide the basis for a brief analysis of the policies Constantine pursued by means of these titles.

Around 330, when Constantinople was inaugurated as an imperial residence, Constantine also reformed the order of imperial *comites*. Imperial *comites* were not a social class but were part of a hierarchical system of honours associated with service to the emperor.⁹⁸ The rank of *comes* was not hereditary. The order was therefore not, as suggested by A. H. M. Jones, a 'third order of nobility'.⁹⁹ More accurate is the term 'Führungselite' proposed by Dirk Schlinkert.¹⁰⁰ The title of *comes*, conferred by imperial codicil, defined closeness to the emperor.¹⁰¹ While the senatorial order had its own historic institutions and rules of membership independent of the emperor, as in the case of equestrians no such institution existed for the *comites*. Their status depended entirely on the emperor. These honours thus had the potential to cut across traditional structures and loyalties.¹⁰²

Whom did Constantine appoint to these honours? There were three regular ranks of companions, the *comites tertii ordinis*, the *comites secundi ordinis* and the *comites primi ordinis* mentioned by Eusebius.¹⁰³ These honours did not coincide

⁹⁷ Smith (2007b) 184; Errington (2006) 150; Potter (2004) 387–8; Scharf (1994) 5.

⁹⁸ Kelly (2012) 196 n. 63 for further refs; Scharf (1994); Bonfils (1981); Jones (1964) I: 104–5, 533–4.

⁹⁹ Jones (1964) 2: 526.

¹⁰⁰ Schlinkert (1998) 159.

¹⁰¹ Scharf (1994) 7.

¹⁰² Errington (2006) 150; Jones (1964) 2: 522–54.

¹⁰³ Eus. *V. Const.* 4.1. For a comprehensive list of recorded *comites ordinis primi* from 330 to 509; Scharf (1994) 59–61.

with other positions, but were held between regular posts in the imperial administration, and it seems that they were merely honorary titles and did not involve presence or duty at court. The *comitiva primi ordinis*, for instance, were conferred prior to the proconsulship of Africa.¹⁰⁴ Alongside this structure, there were also regional *comites*, who were sent to assist, or replace, regular provincial governors in order to tighten imperial oversight in the provinces; the Roman senator Septimius Acindynus is recorded as *comes* in Spain under Crispus, Aconius Catullinus was *comes* in Africa before 337, and Severus, of senatorial rank and probably related to the consul in 323 and urban prefect in 325–6 Acilius Severus, was *comes Hispaniarum* for at least two years from 333 to 335.¹⁰⁵ One officeholder, C. Annius Tiberianus, is recorded as *comes Africae* from 325 to 327, and then in 332 he is documented as *comes* in Spain, and in 333 as *vicarius* there.¹⁰⁶ Tiberianus seems to have been another distinguished senator in comital service: he may have been a descendant of the successful Iunii Tiberiani, one of whom served Diocletian as proconsul in Asia and urban prefect.¹⁰⁷ It is also possible that Tiberianus was related to the Annii, who included the eminent C. Annius Anullinus, urban prefect in 312.¹⁰⁸ A *comes Macedoniae* Acacius is recorded in a law from 327; his rank is not mentioned, but a later reference to Acacius introduces him as *perfectissimus*.¹⁰⁹ Of these regional *comitiva*, which seem to have been conferred on both senators and equestrians, only that of *comes Orientis* became a permanent post.¹¹⁰

Some *comites* were used as ambassadors between the emperor and his subjects.¹¹¹ Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* mentions two

¹⁰⁴ Scharf (1994) 9–10, 21–2.

¹⁰⁵ *PLRE* I: 11 (Acindynus 2); 187 (Catullinus 2); 834 (Severus 16).

¹⁰⁶ *PLRE* I: 911 (Tiberianus 4).

¹⁰⁷ *PLRE* I: 912 (Tiberianus 7), son of *PLRE* I: 912 (Tiberianus 8).

¹⁰⁸ *PLRE* I: 79 (Anullinus 3); for a list of the Annii, see *PLRE* I: 69.

¹⁰⁹ *PLRE* I: 6 (Acacius 3) = 6 (Acacius 4).

¹¹⁰ Migl (1994) 92. The complex relationship between the *uicarii*, regional *comites*, the *vices agentes*, and the praetorian prefects is discussed by Migl (1994) 54–95, who addresses the complex jurisdictions and shifting hierarchies which characterized these posts under Constantine.

¹¹¹ Jones (1964) I: 105.

such active *comites*. In a letter of Constantine preserved in *V. Const.* 3.53.2, the *comes* Acacius, who is probably identical with the *comes Macedoniae* of 327, is also referred to as a 'friend' of the emperor. Acacius is sent to resolve the issue of the – offensive – sacred buildings in Mamre in Palestine. Shortly thereafter, Acacius, together with the *comes* Strategius, is sent to ensure that peace is being observed in Antioch after the unrest following the election of a new bishop.¹¹² It is interesting to note the rank of both these eastern *comites* mentioned by Eusebius: they are *διασημότητος*, that is equestrian, but it is not clear whether they held one of the regular *comitiva* of first, second or third rank. Strategius is known from other sources.¹¹³ Probably a native of Antioch and well-versed in both Greek and Latin, he became a *comes* of Constantine, who employed his services in particular in religious affairs. In addition, Strategius' learning earned him the nickname Musonianus and the respect of Constantine.¹¹⁴

As regards the higher ranking *comites* of second rank, only Roman senators are known to have held these honours. Two of them are recorded. Their careers have already been discussed. Lucius Crepereius Madalianus was *comes secundi ordinis* prior to his appointment as *consularis Ponti et Bithyniae*.¹¹⁵ And Valerius Proculus, who governed Constantinople following its foundation as *consularis* of Europa and Thrace, was subsequently appointed to the governorship of Sicily, and then became *comes secundi ordinis*.¹¹⁶ As regards the *comites* of the first rank, three can be documented, all of them members of the Roman senatorial aristocracy. Besides Proculus again, these were Fabius Titianus, proconsul of Asia under Constantine,¹¹⁷

¹¹² Eus. *V. Const.* 3.62.1 with Barnes (1981) 248. At 247 with n. 16 Barnes connects Acacius and Strategius to the alleged – he calls them systematic – confiscations of temple treasures by Constantine in this period, yet there is no evidence for this.

¹¹³ *PLRE I*: 611 (Strategius Musonianus) with Bradbury (2004) 257 and Warmington (1999).

¹¹⁴ *Amm.* 15.13.2. Warmington (1999) 172 refutes Drijvers (1996), who argued that Strategius' multilingual abilities included knowledge of Aramaic.

¹¹⁵ *PLRE I*: 530 (Madalianus) with Scharf (1994) 16–17. Madalianus and his senatorial colleagues are discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 21–8.

¹¹⁶ *PLRE I*: 747 (Proculus 11).

¹¹⁷ *PLRE I*: 918 (Titianus 6) with Scharf (1994) 9–10.

and Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus, who was *comes primi ordinis* sometime around 336/7.¹¹⁸

The most prestigious comitival honours were those of *comites primi ordinis intra palatium* or *intra consistorium*: these *comitiva* not only involved presence at court, but also granted their bearers access to the imperial *consistorium* as part of the emperor's group of advisers.¹¹⁹ Two *comites* are known to have been awarded this honour after 330. One has already been discussed: this is the Sicilian senator Flavius Dionysius, who was governor of Phoenicia in 328–9 and *consularis Syriae* sometime between 329 and 335.¹²⁰ Sometime before 335 Dionysius was admitted to the imperial consistory as *comes consistorianus*, and later wielded great influence among the councillors of Constantinople, as we have seen. The other known senatorial *comes* at Constantine's court in Constantinople is Valerius Proculus.¹²¹ Following his posts on the Bosphorus and in Sicily, Proculus became *comes* of the second and then of the first rank. However, like other leading Roman senators in office in the East, he returned to the West and held further offices there. Constantine made him proconsul of Africa with extraordinary judicial authority also over neighbouring provinces from 332 to 333.¹²² Sometime between 333 and 337 he was awarded the rank of *comes primi ordinis intra palatium* and recalled to the East to participate in the imperial *consistorium* in Constantinople. In 337 Proculus then became Constantine's last urban prefect in Rome. One explanation for Proculus' success is obvious: Constantine praised Proculus as *insignem nobilitate prosapiam Proculi*, which reflects not only the senators' but also the emperor's respect for his family pedigree and social status.¹²³ That Proculus was an aristocrat from

¹¹⁸ *PLRE* I: 512 (Lollianus 5) with Scharf (1994) 10–14.

¹¹⁹ Scharf (1994) esp. 22.

¹²⁰ *PLRE* I: 259 (Dionysius 11) with Barnes (1982) 153–4.

¹²¹ *PLRE* I: 747 (Proculus 11).

¹²² On the nature of this post: Salway (2007b) 1281; Migl (1994) 80–1; *contra*: Barnes (1981), who argues that Proculus was regular praetorian prefect. Oshimizu (2012) 197–8 discusses the relevant inscriptions.

¹²³ *ILS* 1222.

Constantine's Eastern Roman Empire

Rome was not a hindrance to his success in the East and at court but, as should be clear by now, a major advantage.¹²⁴

Finally, there are the Flavian *comites*. This honour, introduced around 333, seems to have been a special appointment linked to actual personal service to Constantine, since it cannot be documented after his death in 337.¹²⁵ Two such *comites Flaviales* are known: L. Crepereius Madalianus was *comes Flavialis* prior to being *consularis* in Pontus and Bithynia, and Egnatius Lollianus served as *comes Flavialis* prior to his appointment as *comes Orientis*.¹²⁶ It is noteworthy that these *comitiva* ranked relatively low, below the *comitiva primi ordinis* and below the post of *comes Orientis*.

All in all, the comital reform offered a suitably flexible hierarchy of posts and titles that made it possible to link eastern provincial supporters as well as Roman senators to the imperial court in Constantinople. However, in this new system of honours as in the provincial administration, Roman senators were treated with due deference: in the new imperial hierarchy of the order of *comites* they not only acquired numerous honours, but also saw their senatorial rank respected.¹²⁷ Indeed, Constantine granted several of them high honours at court, sometimes with the right to attend the imperial *consistorium*. The highest honours in his new hierarchy were reserved for distinguished Roman senators, powerful men like Madalianus, Lollianus and Proculus, who remained, however, firmly attached to Rome.

Constantine's Eastern Roman Empire

The continuous presence of Roman senators in Constantine's eastern administration and at court, and the use of the image of the *equus Romanus* on Constantine's vicennialian coinage

¹²⁴ *Contra*: Cameron (2011) 141: 'Though an aristocrat of old Rome, Proculus enjoyed high favour with Constantine.'

¹²⁵ Scharf (1994) 70–1.

¹²⁶ *PLRE*: 530 (Madalianus 1), 512 (Lollianus 5) with Scharf (1994) 65–71.

¹²⁷ *Contra*: Potter (2013) 265, who sees Constantine equating ranks 'without making a man's birth status a determining factor in his career'.

call into question the conventional view, which has been supported recently by Alexander Skinner, that Constantine presented himself to his eastern audience less as a Roman and more as a hellenophile emperor.¹²⁸ The Roman character of Constantine's eastern rule is confirmed by other evidence. In his *Letter to the Provincials*, Constantine referred to his people as the Ῥωμαίων γένος, the Roman people, and to his empire as ἡ Ῥωμαϊκή οἰκουμένη, the Roman community.¹²⁹ This view of the empire is taken up by his biographer Eusebius:

The whole Roman dominion was joined together, the peoples of the East being united with the other half, and the whole body was orderly disposed by the single universal government acting as its head, the authority of a single ruler reaching every part. [...] He brought under his control one Roman empire united as of old, the first to proclaim to all the monarchy of God, and by monarchy himself directing the whole of life under Roman rule.¹³⁰

In Eusebius, there is also an emphasis on restoration and the continuation and respect for the traditions of the empire, as is implied by the preservation of the social hierarchy of the empire in Constantine's administration and imperial companions.

Eusebius' account reveals that Constantine placed great emphasis on being a Latin emperor. When he asked Eusebius to send theological treatises to Constantinople, these had to be in the Ῥωμαίων γλώττα, in Latin, so some of Eusebius' artful Greek style was lost in the process.¹³¹ Constantine's conduct at the Council of Nicaea in 325 is a good example of the dynamics of his use of the Latin language. Eusebius reports that the emperor delivered his speech in Latin, Ῥωμαίᾳ γλώττῃ, in the Roman tongue, yet after he had spoken he and the bishops discussed some of the matters at stake in Greek; Constantine was – in Eusebius' partisan view – not only fluent in Greek but in fact so well-versed in Greek rhetoric that he

¹²⁸ Skinner (2008), (2000).

¹²⁹ Eus. *V. Const.* 2.53. The veracity of the letters and other documents cited by Eusebius seemed highly questionable until the discovery of a contemporary papyrus (*P. Lond.* 3: 878) containing passages of an official document discussed by Eusebius (*V. Const.* 2.24–42); Schneider (2007) 22; Cameron and Hall (1999) 16–21.

¹³⁰ Eus. *V. Const.* 2.19.1–2 (trans. Cameron and Hall (2001)).

¹³¹ Eus. *V. Const.* 4.35.

was able to defeat even the best speakers in the audience.¹³² All of Constantine's speeches were in Latin, and had to be turned into Greek by professional translators.¹³³ Greek translations circulated at times: according to Eusebius, the emperor's letter to the provincials in Palestine circulated in both Latin and Greek.¹³⁴ Even so, Constantine's conscious use of Latin is remarkable: this was the language of the Romans, ἡ Ῥωμαίων φωνή, Eusebius notes, and as such it was a clear statement of the power and superiority of a Roman emperor over the Greek East.¹³⁵

Contemporary papyri also reveal that Constantine ordered the replacement of the traditional *SEBASTOS* in the imperial titulature, which had still been in use in the Greek translation of Latin documents under the Tetrarchy, by the Latinized title *AVGOVSTOS*.¹³⁶ This replacement can be traced to a deliberate, centrally directed initiative.¹³⁷ One reason for the change may have been the emperor's desire to suppress connotations of imperial cult connected with *SEBASTOS*, not appropriate for a Christian emperor.¹³⁸ If this was the initial reasoning, then Eusebius missed the point: when he (or his sources) rendered Constantine's Latin titulature, Augustus is mostly still translated as *Sebastos*.¹³⁹ I am thus inclined to conclude that

¹³² Eus. *V. Const.* 3.13.1–2 with Van Dam (2007) 195–8. A similar argument about the Greek-language abilities of a Roman emperor is made by Libanius in his panegyric on Constantian II, who is praised for asserting himself in the city council of Constantinople, *Lib. Or.* 59.97, on which see Chapter 4, p. 134 n. 60.

¹³³ Eus. *V. Const.* 4.30.32. Similarly, Constantine's letter to the Persian king was circulating in its Latin version: Eus. *V. Const.* 4.8.

¹³⁴ Eus. *V. Const.* 2.23.

¹³⁵ Eus. *V. Const.* 2.47.1. On the use of Latin as a mark of allegiance and political loyalty in the official correspondence between Greek subjects and Roman rulers in the East, as witnessed by inscriptions from eastern provinces: e.g. Brélaz (2004); Feissel (2007) n. 43. See also Dagron (1984).

¹³⁶ Salway (2007a) 40 with further references.

¹³⁷ Salway (2007a), who analyses papyri from Egypt, dates this change in the eastern provinces held by Licinius to after 324. However, it is possible that the shift occurred earlier in the other Greek-speaking parts of the East, which came into Constantine's possession in 316, such as e.g. Achaëa: Wienand (2017) 11–12. That said, there is reason to think that such a fundamental change in imperial titulature was the result of a profound reordering of the imperial system, which only occurred in 324, so Salway's dating is perhaps to be preferred.

¹³⁸ Salway (2007a) 49–50; see also Barnes (2002) 200–1.

¹³⁹ E.g. Eus. *V. Const.* 2.46.1, 48.1.

the new title was chosen on account of its Roman resonances, which spoke loudly of Roman power in the Greek-speaking East. When Constantine presented himself to his new eastern subjects, he consciously paraded the image of a resolutely victorious Latin Roman emperor. Constantine's eastern empire was a Latin empire, as the eastern cities quickly gathered. While cities had still addressed emperors in Greek under the Tetrarchy, under Constantine they opted for Latin, as the Latin petition of the eastern town Orcistus reveals:¹⁴⁰ 'For them, both city and notables, the reign of Constantine seemed to mark more of a cultural revolution than a religious revolution. Orcistus looked at the reign of Constantine and decided that the future lay not necessarily with Christianity, but with the use of Latin.'¹⁴¹

Besides his Roman personnel and his insistence on the use of Latin, Constantine's use of the image of the Roman knight, *eques*, on his vicennial coinage reveals that he was also keen to present himself as the preserver of Rome's political traditions in the East. In this vein, Constantine reactivated two traditional titles of the senatorial order. The first was that of *ensor*. This had lost its previous meaning and became a title of distinction only.¹⁴² It was bestowed on his half-brother Flavius Dalmatius together with the consulship in 333.¹⁴³ Constantine also re-employed the title of patrician (*patricius*). This was no longer hereditary, but was used to distinguish prominent individuals. Two Constantinian *patricii* are known, and their careers suggest that the new title had a dynastic dimension: both are closely

¹⁴⁰ The epigraphic record of Orcistus contains several communications between the Greek city and the Latin imperial court. All the communications are in Latin, which is a sharp contrast to the widespread use of Greek under the Tetrarchs in similar addresses to the emperors, which, as Van Dam (2007) 196–7 and Feissel (1995) 47 n. 79, have noted, suggests that a preference for Latin was known among the Greek provincials; for the advance of Latin in the Roman East: Eck (2009); Isaac (2009); Millar (2009); Van Dam (2007) 186–93; Liebeschuetz (1972) 250–5.

¹⁴¹ Van Dam (2007) 185–200, quotation at 198.

¹⁴² For *ensor* as a title and not an office: Barnes (1982) 105; (1981) 251. Pace Chastagnol (1992) 253–4, 347; Stein (1968) 100.

¹⁴³ Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* 65, which refers to events in 333, is the earliest source for Dalmatius' censorship. Dalmatius resided at the court of the young Caesar Constantius in Antioch, where he was entrusted with both military and religious missions: *PLRE I*: 240 (Dalmatius 6).

associated with the imperial family. As Timothy Barnes has noted, as in the case of the title *ensor*, which was also linked to the consulship, the title of *patricius* was used to distinguish members of the imperial family without officially including them in the imperial college,¹⁴⁴ which remained reserved for Constantine and his sons. At the same time, the revival of these old titles displayed Constantine's respect for the political – or rather senatorial – traditions of Rome. The first to have been awarded the revived title of *patricius* was the teacher Flavius Optatus, who taught Licinius' son and later probably the sons of Constantine.¹⁴⁵ Optatus, who was probably married to a relative of Constantine's mother Helena, became a *patricius* in 334 when he was made consul. The second *patricius* was Julius Constantius,¹⁴⁶ Constantine's half-brother; he was awarded the title at the latest by 335, when he became consul. His honours had a special political importance: as discussed in [Chapter 1](#), Julius was married to Galla, a member of the old Roman senatorial family of the Neratii.¹⁴⁷ The glory of these titles not only highlighted the importance of the imperial dynasty, but also emphasized their alliance with the Roman aristocracy and the importance of the senate and its traditions in the empire of Constantine. Overall, Constantine's eastern rule was not a Greek, but a Roman one.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has argued that the involvement of Roman senators was an important characteristic of Constantine's eastern rule. Their presence was sought both in the provincial administration and at court. In both these systems of honours, their rank was carefully respected, so equestrian supporters of Constantine had to content themselves with lower-ranking titles and posts while the senators

¹⁴⁴ Barnes (1978) 62.

¹⁴⁵ *PLRE*: 650 (Optatus 3) with Kelly (2012) 197 and n. 66 with further reference to the new patriciate; Barnes (1982) 107.

¹⁴⁶ *PLRE* I: 226 (Constantius 7).

¹⁴⁷ *PLRE* I: 382 (Galla 1). Marriage: Chapter 1, p. 33.

A Unified Roman Empire (AD 312–337)

occupied the higher echelons of both hierarchies. Further, there is no conclusive evidence for the existence of a 'senate' in Constantinople in the reign of Constantine, no imperially driven recruitment scheme for senators, nor a detectable presence of eastern senators; nor can the existence of praetors as part of the urban council in Constantinople be substantiated. The available sources do, however, reveal that Constantine's rule in the East was consciously styled as a traditional Roman one, for instance by insisting on the use of Latin, reintroducing traditional Roman titles and changing from *Sebastos* to *Augoustos* in imperial titulature. All in all, Constantine's eastern rule was consciously Roman in its governors, social hierarchy, institutions and political language.

PART II

RULING THE EAST (AD 337–350)

CHAPTER 3

THE SENATORIAL OFFICIALS OF CONSTANTIUS II

In 339, an official of the city of Rome was moved to mark his term of office with statue monuments to the imperial house. Aurelius Avianius Symmachus, *praefectus annonae* of Rome and father of the more famous writer and politician Aurelius Symmachus, dedicated a statue in Rome to the emperor Constantius II, and one in Ostia to the emperor Constantine II.¹ Following Constantine II's death in 340, his statue was then rededicated to Constantius II. However, in 340 Italy was nominally the realm of Constans, and Avianius was in office in Rome. So why rededicate the statue to Constantius II, emperor of the East with his seat in Antioch, rather than to Constans, who ruled over Rome, the seat of Avianius' office? This rededication is all the more striking given the conventional view of the state of the empire in this period as one divided between Constans and Constantius. In this arrangement, Constantius is believed to have been cut off from access to the senate of Rome. As a result, so it is argued, Constantius rallied the support of eastern elites gathered in Constantinople – which he promoted as a rival to Rome.² That said, it has been pointed out that there was a certain degree of flux within this 'east–west' divide: scholars have noted that Roman senators took up office in the East and that there were senatorial supporters of Constantius in Rome, yet this has not been further investigated.³ The question thus remains how this situation can be aligned

¹ *PLRE* I: 863 (Symmachus 3). Rome: *CIL* VI 36954b (+ p. 4355) = *LSA* 1370 (Machado); Ostia: *AE* 1988, 217 = *LSA* 2574 (Machado).

² Skinner (2008); Errington (2006) 149–51; Vanderspoel (1995) 61; Jones (1964) 1: 132.

³ Harries (2012) 191–2 and Caillan Davenport in a forthcoming article.

with the rededication by Avianus. I argue in this chapter that the senatorial careers of this period reveal that the joint empire of the brother emperors was not divided in senatorial terms. There was only one senate, in Rome, whose members served also in the East, as had again been the case since Constantine (see [Chapter 1](#)).

After a brief outline of the political situation of the joint reign of the brother emperors Constans and Constantius in the 340s, the second section of this chapter provides an updated discussion of senatorial appointments. This shows that throughout this period Constantius ruled the East also with the support of the Roman senate, falling back on a pattern re-established by his father. The third section, ‘Harnessing Roman Senators’, which studies the careers of the senatorial supporters of Constantius in more detail, then shows that, as was the case under Constantine, the senators of Rome in Constantius’ administration advanced on an empire-wide *cursus honorum*; its summit remained the urban prefecture in Rome. As under Constantine, many became influential *comites* at the emperors’ court. The unity of the empire is also highlighted in the consular appointments of the period. In turn, and as suggested in the fourth section of the chapter, this offers an interesting new perspective on the relationship between the two brother emperors, in that there is reason to assume they were rivals also for senatorial support from Rome. Altogether, this chapter delineates how, in the eyes of the Roman senate, the eastern empire was considered part of its sphere of influence and officeholding, and that, for the Roman senators, Constantius II was a powerful patron and promoter of career interests alongside his brother Constans.

A Separated Empire?

This section briefly revisits the evidence for the assumed division of the empire during the joint rule of Constans and Constantius between 340 and 350, as a backdrop against which the prosopographical data analysed in the following sections can more fruitfully be understood. Though reunited

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II

under Constantine in 324, following his death the empire was again divided among three emperors, his sons Constantine II, Constantius II and Constans. On 9 September 337, after an interregnum of three months following Constantine's burial, they were formally confirmed as the new legitimate Augusti.⁴ Each was made responsible for a part of the empire, which was partitioned between them. The oldest, Constantine II, ruled over Gaul, Spain and Britain; the youngest, Constans, whose court was probably in Milan, held power over territory from Italy to the western parts of the region of Thrace, including Macedonia and Achaëa, while Constantius remained in charge of the eastern provinces including the diocese of Thrace with Constantinople.⁵ In early 340 Constantine II marched against his brother Constans, but this endeavour was unsuccessful and the aggressor died soon after the outbreak of the civil war, in early 340.⁶ Henceforth the empire was split between Constans, who now ruled two-thirds of it, including Rome, and Constantius, who reigned over the smaller but wealthier and more populous part of the empire.⁷

The joint rule of Constans and Constantius is generally believed to have been marked by harsh, even hostile conflict between the emperors and a strong separation between their

⁴ Date: *Chron. Min.* 1.235 with Barnes (1981) 261–2. For a detailed discussion of these events, see Frakes (2012) 98–101; Burgess (2008); Hunt (1998) 1–5; Klein (1979); Chantraine (1992a); and my discussion in Chapter 4, pp. 150–3.

⁵ For the dating of the reassignment of eastern Thrace to Constantius to 337: Skinner (2008) 143; Bleckmann (2003a) 236; Hunt (1998) 4; Barnes (1993) 35; Jones (1964) 1: 112. As a result Constantius was in a position to transfer Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, a close adviser to the imperial family who had baptized Constantine, to Constantinople, *Soc.* 11.7. *Contra*: Seeck (1919) 42, who dates the incident to 340. I return to this division of the empire under Constantine's sons in Chapter 4.

⁶ Death of Constantine II: at the latest in a law, *CTh* 12.11.1, issued by Constans on 29 April 340, the dead Constantine II was declared 'public enemy and our own enemy'. Ancient authors attribute the blame for the outbreak of hostilities to the older Constantine II: Frakes (2012) 100; Hunt (1998) 5; Bleckmann (2003a) offers a detailed discussion of the evidence.

⁷ Barceló (2004) 59. The wealth of the eastern provinces, their cities and their products/characteristics are described in the *Exp. tot. mundi* written in the late 350s. On the date (359/60), see Rougé (1966) 9–26. On the rule of Constans, see e.g. *Lib. Or.* 59, *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 42.23–6; *Eutrop.* 10.9; *Zos.* 2.42; and Moser (2017); Maraval (2013) 42–61; Harries (2012) 189–96; Callu (1992), (1987).

spheres of influence.⁸ This impression is based largely on Christian sources of the period, notably the Nicene bishops Lucifer of Cagliari, Hilary of Poitiers and Athanasius of Alexandria, exiled on the orders of Constantius, a supporter of the Homoean creed; their writings have been taken to show that the joint rule of Constans and Constantius was, overall, a difficult affair due to their personal involvement in the ecclesiastical disputes of the time.⁹ In particular, the exiled bishop Athanasius, whose restoration to Alexandria was a central point of ecclesiastical contention,¹⁰ has influenced modern assessments of their rule.¹¹ His (heavily slanted) evidence suggests that when the Council of Serdica (in late 342) failed to settle the matters in dispute Constans sent a letter threatening his brother with war should he not restore the exiled bishops Paul to Constantinople and Athanasius to Alexandria; the existence of the letter is debated, but the failure of the council seems indeed to have led to a noticeable cessation of communication between the ruling pair.¹² In any event, probably in part as a result of renewed Persian activities on the eastern front, Constantius gave in to Constans' demands.¹³ In early 344, the exiled bishops were recalled, and in September of the same year Constantius permitted the return of Athanasius, presbyters and deacons to Alexandria.¹⁴

The dispute over Athanasius' restoration to Alexandria is interesting because it implies the existence of a separated empire in which Constans, as emperor of only the West, was not entitled to reappoint the exiled bishop. By contrast, imperial

⁸ On the supposed crisis between the two brothers, see also the discussions offered by Maraval (2013) 50–61; Portmann (2002) 22–43, and Potter (2004) 462–7.

⁹ On their works, see Flower (2016), (2013); Girardet (1975).

¹⁰ Potter (2004) 410–22 esp. 420–2, 462–7; Harries (2012) 243–8; Vanderspoel (1995) 72–3; Barnes (1993) 56–100. For Constantius' Christian policies more broadly, see Diefenbach (2015), (2012); Leppin (2007), (1999); Barceló (2004); Laconi (2004); McLynn (2004) 242–50; Barnes (1993) 165–75, (1989a), (1978); Dihle (1989); Frend (1989); Noethlichs (1989); Klein (1977); Edbrooke (1976), (1975).

¹¹ Barceló (2004); Olbrich (2004); Potter (2004) 463–7; Barnes (1993); Klein (1977).

¹² For a precise chronology, see Barnes (1978) 65–9 and Portmann (2002) 22–43.

¹³ Constantius' eastern campaigns are conveniently discussed in Harries (2012) 214–17; Hunt (1998) 12–14.

¹⁴ Ath. *Hist. Ar.* 21.1. Barnes (1993) 87–93.

communications proclaimed the unity of their empire. One panegyric of this period has survived that deals with the relationship between the brother emperors. It was delivered by the Antiochean orator Libanius to a high official in the East and praises the unity of the empire under the two brothers.¹⁵ To make his point, Libanius dwells in particular on four military events, two for each emperor. The same events are celebrated in a series of bronze coins, distributed in 346/7, perhaps for the centenary of the city of Rome, which bear the legend *FEL(icium) TEM(porum) REPARATIO* ('Happy times have been restored').¹⁶ The matching of Libanius' four examples in this coin series of 346/7 makes it very likely that these four images were the stock motifs used in imperial communications to represent the empire(s) of Constans and Constantius. Here as in Libanius' speech, Constans' diplomatic treaty with the Franks was likened to Constantius' resettlement of a Gothic tribe to Thrace, and the former's winter expedition to Britain to the latter's successes against the Persian royal house.¹⁷ The scenes are evenly divided between the two emperors: as the mint pattern suggests, each emperor minted two images. On the obverse the coins show the busts of Constans and Constantius respectively, sometimes holding a globe.¹⁸ Hence both Libanius' panegyric and the coin series divide the empire into two parts of equal importance, each ruled by its own emperor. The point, however, is that together they form one harmonious empire, one political entity. This notion is underlined by imperial coinage more generally: both emperors continuously struck coins to commemorate their joint rule also outside this coin series. This holds in particular for Constantius II, who remembered Constans even in his victory coinage on the Persian front as well as in most other coin series he produced.¹⁹

¹⁵ Lib. *Or.* 59, with Malosse (2003); Portmann (2002); Seiler (1998) esp. 19–72; Wiemer (1994); Callu (1987).

¹⁶ Kraft (1958) 112–16 with tables of the allocation of the four coin types to the imperial mints. For a concise overview of the discussion on the date and occasion of this series, see Maraval (2013) 50–60, who refutes the dating of Olbrich (2004).

¹⁷ Kraft (1958).

¹⁸ Kraft (1958) 142.

¹⁹ See relevant entries in *RIC* VIII. Some coins of Constantius are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

As was to be expected, the unity of the empire was also upheld by imperial legislation. There seems to have been some real collaboration on legal issues: Jean-Pierre Callu's detailed analysis of the legislation of the imperial brothers is able to identify transfers of legal innovations between them, and hence real accord between the two courts.²⁰

There are thus conflicting accounts about the unity of the empire in this period. Who is to be believed? It is clear that the persecuted bishops and the emperors themselves are both highly partial sources for the state of the empire in this decade. While the bishops could hope to profit from dissent, the emperors were keen to present the empire as unified as a way of countering such potentially peace-threatening interpretations. This holds in particular for Constantius II, who seems to have been repeatedly willing to give in to Constans' demands, as in the case of Athanasius.

There is, however, a third group of contemporary documents of significance here: the inscriptions of honorary statue or building dedications set up during the 340s. Analysis of these very different documents suggests that in the public sphere, away from these Christian debates and imperial representations, the empire was seen by its governors and provincials as a unified one ruled by two emperors. Thus when the city of Sagalassus in Asia Minor set up statues to the imperial house in the 340s, they erected not one but two statues, one for each of the ruling pair, Constans and Constantius.²¹ The same holds for an inscription from Berytus set up by the regional council, which honours both emperors as eternal rulers, *dd. nn. Constanti et*

²⁰ Callu (1992). On the legislation of the two brothers, see also Bonfils (1983) and Cuneo (2001). Cuneo points out that most of their laws will have been issued in the name of both emperors; the absence of the name of Constans from many laws from the period is probably the result of retrospective 'corrections'. In particular the absence of Constans in laws issued in his imperial domain is suspect: *CTh* 9.17.1, 10.14.2, 10.10.6, 11.16.5, 10.10.7, 7.1.2. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest Constantius continued to issue laws in the name of his brother right into 352 (*CTh* 15.14.25 on the revocation of Magnentian law) and perhaps even 355 (*CTh* 3.12.3), see de Bonfils (1983) 300.

²¹ *AE* 1995, 1554 = *LSA* 2524 (U. Gehn) and Devijver and Waelkens (1995) 177 no. 3 = *LSA* 2525 (U. Gehn), discussed in detail in Moser (2016a) 1240–1.

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II

*Constantis aeternorum principum.*²² Both emperors were also commemorated in inscriptions set up by high officials. In 349 the proconsul of Asia, Caelius Montius, restored two buildings linked to the public provision of water in Ephesus, the nymphaeum on the upper agora and parts of the baths in the harbour; in the building inscriptions set up on each occasion, Montius is said to have honoured both emperors with honorary statues, with a Greek inscription at the nymphaeum and a Latin one at the baths.²³ This is important, as it reveals that Montius, who will have taken his orders from Constantius II, was eager to represent the empire as ruled by two emperors. By this he was suggesting that it was appropriate to honour in the inscriptions not only his direct superior but also Constans, who had no authority over Ephesus.

So it seems that, while there may have been some tension between the ruling brothers during their joint reign, the Christian descriptions of their empire as marked above all by dissent and aggression must be taken with a pinch of salt: in 340 Avianius seems to have sided with Constantius, and in 349 the people of Sagalassus as well as the senatorial proconsul of Asia evidently still thought that they were ruled by two emperors, even though Asia Minor was securely in Constantius II's imperial domain.

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II: 337 to 350

This section furnishes a revised list of the senatorial officials in the eastern administration of Constantius ([Appendix C](#)).²⁴ The key question is whether the empire-wide *cursum honorum*

²² *CIL* III 167 + p. 971 = *ILS* 1234 = *LSA* 1190 (U. Gehn).

²³ Greek inscriptions at the nymphaeum: *LSA* 739 (A. Sokolicek) = *IvE* 1316 = Engelmann, Knibbe, Merkelbach (1980b) 170–1 no. 1316; Roueché (2009) 155–6, p. 164 figure 1 and *LSA* 2079 = *IvE* 5322 = Roueché (2009) 156 figure 2; Latin at baths: *LSA* 744 (A. Sokolicek) = *CIL* III 14195 = *ILS* 5704 = *IvE* 1314 + *LSA* 2080 = *IvE* 1315. Two torsos of the Antonine period but reworked in the mid-fourth century and found next to the nymphaeum may have once been erected on the two statue bases of the monument, representing Constans and Constantius: *LSA* 1122 + 1123 (J. Attinger); Heberdey et al. (1912), p. suppl. 117 figures 137–8.

²⁴ The list is based on *PLRE* I; Migl (1994); Kuhoff (1983); Malcus (1967); which have been revised in the light of recent epigraphic finds.

re-established by Constantine remained in place, as has been argued in recent scholarship; that is, whether the senatorial posts in the eastern administration remained part of the career ladder attached to the senate in Rome, or whether there emerged a new, eastern hierarchy of senatorial posts attached to Constantinople.²⁵ I begin the list of Constantius' senatorial officials with his first praetorian prefect in the East, the Roman senator Septimius Acindynus.²⁶ Acindynus held this post from 338 to 340, in the immediate aftermath of the demise of the praetorian prefect Ablabius, whom Constantius had executed in mid-337.²⁷ Acindynus is attested in post in Antioch, where he may have served Constantius in ministerial duties at court.²⁸ Between 324 and 337, prior to taking up office in the East, Acindynus was a (senatorial) *vicarius* in Spain.²⁹ What was his social background? The praetorian prefect is often believed to have been a Christian, due to his success under Constantius.³⁰ However, this was strongly cast into doubt when a fragment of an honorary inscription from Mérida (Roman Augusta Emerita) was found that sheds new light on Acindynus' career and furnishes important additional details about his family background. The inscription was published in 2000 by José Carlos Saquete, who offers a detailed discussion of the text;³¹ I present his restoration of the inscription in full:

Septimio A[cindyno, u(iro) c(larissimo)] | Correcto[ri Tusciae] | et Vmbri[ae,
pont(ifici) maio] | [r]i?, XV [ui]r[o s(acris) f(aciundis), agenti?] | [per Hispanias
uices?] | [praef(ectorum) praet(orio), uice s(acra) c(ognoscens)?]

The first four lines of the inscription indicate that Acindynus started his administrative career as *corrector* in the province

²⁵ In a forthcoming article, Caillan Davenport offers a complementary discussion of the government of the empire in the 340s. See also Harries (2012) 191–2.

²⁶ *PLRE* I: 11 (Acindynus 2) with Symm. *Ep.* 1.1.3: *Aurorae in populis regum praetoria rexi.*

²⁷ On Ablabius: Porena (2003) 409–10, 481; Migl (1994) 41–9, 95–6; and my discussion of his career in Chapter 2, pp. 66–9, and Chapter 4, p. 152.

²⁸ On the ministerial praetorian prefects in contrast to the regional prefects: Migl (1994) esp. 33–175; Vogler (1979) 130–9.

²⁹ Date of the vicariate: Saquete (2000) 284.

³⁰ Barnes (1995) 147, but see von Haehling (1978) 58.

³¹ Saquete (2000).

of Tusciana and Umbria, an appointment that was not known before. More significantly, Acindynus was able to occupy two priesthoods in his career, being *pontifex maior* and *XVvir sacris faciundis*. This epigraphic find is a useful example of the difficulty in determining the religious affiliation of senatorial officeholders in this period: until it was found, Acindynus was considered a Christian due to his success at Constantius' court. While his precise religious affiliation remains unproven, this inscription implies Acindynus' active participation in the traditional cults of Rome, which in turn suggests that he was a member of one of the oldest Roman senatorial families.³² Our senator was probably the offspring of a senatorial family whose success in office dated back at least to the late third century, when another Septimius Acindynus (presumably his father) was urban prefect of Rome from 293 to 295.³³ He was also very wealthy. From a letter of Avianius' son Symmachus we know that Acindynus' family possessed a large house at Bauli on the Campanian coast, where many leading Roman senators had estates.³⁴ The estate must have been substantial, as it was later bought by the senator Vitrasius Orfitus, who was Constantius' key senatorial ambassador in Rome and hence one of Rome's most powerful senators at the time.³⁵ In his letter, Symmachus, whose wife, the daughter of Orfitus, inherited the house from her father, includes several epigrams on the series of ancestor portraits he ordered to be displayed in the villa. A recent commentary on the text has noted how one of these reveals that Acindynus, himself the son of a high-ranking Roman magistrate worthy of the *toga picta*, married into a family from Attica: his father-in-law is depicted wearing a *palla*, the Greek cloak.³⁶ Perhaps Acindynus' marriage connections indicate that he also held office in Greece under Constantine, possibly as another distinguished senatorial proconsul in

³² Cameron (2011) 132–72.

³³ *PLRE* I: 11 (Acindynus 1).

³⁴ Sym. *Ep.* 1.1; estates: Cecconi (1998) 153–8, (1994) 136–41; Vera (1986).

³⁵ *PLRE* I: 651 (Orfitus 3). On Orfitus see my discussion in Chapter 7, pp. 279, 297–8.

³⁶ Sym *Ep.* 1.1.3 with Salzman and Roberts (2012) 5–11, who offer a detailed commentary on the letter and its socio-political context.

Achaea; however, this must remain only a hypothesis, albeit a likely one, since Acindynus was an important political player under Constantine and his sons, as is highlighted by his nomination as consul together with Constantine's leading senatorial supporter Proculus in 340.³⁷ What does this mean for his appointment as praetorian prefect in the East in 338? Considering his eminent career and his family background, Constantius must have considered Acindynus a suitable candidate for the eastern prefecture in 338: a man of his standing had the capacity to restore order to a region that had been gravely shaken by the events of 337, and in particular the murder of Constantine's court supporters in Constantinople. His later promotion to the consulship suggests that he passed this test with flying colours.

Acindynus was not the only elite Roman senator in office under Constantius: Placidus, who has been identified by Alan Cameron as a member of the closed circle of leading senatorial families in Rome, was appointed to the combined post of *comes Orientis, Aegypti* and *Mesopotamiae* with jurisdictional authority, from 340 to 342.³⁸ A distinguished background is also a feature of his successor Vulcacius Rufinus, former *consularis Numidiae*, whose family had even been able to marry into the imperial house: his sister Galla had married one of Constantine's half-brothers during the reign of Constantine (as discussed in [Chapter 1](#)).³⁹ Between 337 and 342, Vulcacius became *comes primi ordinis intra consistorium* at the court of Constantius.⁴⁰ As with the appointment of Acindynus, here too it seems that Constantius employed these distinguished Roman senators to bolster his imperial position, here following the death of Constantine II in 340, which had made Constans emperor over two-thirds of the empire. In this position, the political alliance with these men may have helped to confirm

³⁷ *PLRE I*: 747 (Proculus 11), 11 (Acindynus 2) with Bagnall (1987) 214–15.

³⁸ *PLRE I*: 705 (Placidus 2) with Chastagnol (1962) 125–8 no. 49; Cameron (2011) 132–41.

³⁹ *PLRE I*: 782 (Rufinus 25).

⁴⁰ Comes of Constantius: Scharf (1994) 23.

Constantius' imperial claim as senior Augustus (the letter is discussed in detail in [Chapter 4](#)).

The career of Constantius' second known praetorian prefect, Flavius Domitius Leontius, is more difficult to reconstruct.⁴¹ It is not clear how long he served Constantius in this office. A law addressed to him as *Domitio Leontio p(raefecto)p(raetori)o* implies that he was already praetorian prefect in 340; in view of the fact that Acindynus was also prefect of Constantius at this date, the editors of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I* suggest that Leontius was still *vicarius* at this stage. However, I think it is also possible that Constantius appointed two praetorian prefects in the difficult political context of 340, when it may have seemed appropriate to shore up support in the East after Constans' rise to sole rule in the West, one at court (Acindynus) and one in the provinces.⁴²

Was Leontius also a senator from Rome? A statue dedication from Berytus has been cited as a basis for counting him among Constantius' new eastern supporters.⁴³ The inscription was chiselled on the base of an honorific bronze statue set up to Leontius by the city of Berytus when he was consul and praetorian prefect (i.e. in 344). The text lauds him for his speedy rise to these highest ranking offices: *prouocantibus eius meritis, quae per singulos honorum gradus ad hos [e]um dignitatum apices prouexerunt*.⁴⁴ This has been cited as an indication of non-senatorial birth, but there is no evidence for this assumption.

Did Leontius originate in the East? This has often been claimed, with the statue in Berytus taken to imply that he was a son of the city. Yet this is not stated in the dedication, nor

⁴¹ *PLRE I*: 502 (Leontius 20).

⁴² On Domitius Leontius as praetorian prefect in 340, see also Porena (2003) 455. On the unknown location of Leontius' position: Migl (1994) 100–2, who however suggests that Leontius was prefect in Dalmatius' former realms until Constantius ceded them to Constans in 338. It is often argued that Constantinople was the regular seat of the praetorian prefect of the East after 328: Porena (2003) 543–55; Migl (1994) 120–1. However, the lack of secure data recording prefects as resident in Constantinople in this period means that this assumption must remain hypothetical.

⁴³ *PLRE I*: 502 (Leontius 20) with Barnes (1992) 253.

⁴⁴ *CIL III* 167 + p. 971 = *ILS* 1234 = *LSA* 1190 (U. Gehr).

was the inscription set up by the *ordo* of Berytus on its own account: the municipal councillors were acting by decree of the provincial assembly of Phoenice (which, notably, considered both Constans and Constantius to be their emperors, as their reference to *dd. nn. Constanti et Constantis aeternorum principum* reveals). In the text there is no reference to a close connection to the city, whether by origin or patronage. The statue may have been the result of Leontius' sojourn in the region more generally; or perhaps he had assisted the city in some other way during his prefecture; or retired there after the end of his prefecture in 344. His merits must have been substantial, since bronze statues were an outstanding honour in this period, requiring imperial permission (as is indicated in the inscription: *sententia diuina firmatis*). So it cannot be determined whether he was a new man from the East or an established senator from Rome.

However, I believe that, contrary to what has been argued by others, another Leontius, this time Constantius' *comes Orientis* from 349, was not a new eastern senator.⁴⁵ A western, Roman descent is more likely in view of his later career. This Leontius seems to have been a native speaker of Latin: upon leaving office as *comes Orientis* and prior to his appointment in Rome, he was *quaestor sacri palatii* at the court of Gallus, a post which demanded an excellent command of Latin and Roman law.⁴⁶ In 355, he was then appointed urban prefect in Rome in 355,⁴⁷ an office otherwise given only to Roman senators by birth, who had the necessary personal contacts to manage the office successfully. Ammianus' praise of Leontius' urban prefecture in 355 offers additional support for Roman descent: his success in office indicates that he was able to rally local senatorial support for his administration, which, in turn, suggests a certain familiarity – probably quite literally – with the Roman aristocracy.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ *PLRE* I: 500 (Leontius 5) with Maraval (2013) 181.

⁴⁶ On the late antique quaestorship, see Harries (1988).

⁴⁷ *PLRE* I: 503 (Leontius 22).

⁴⁸ *Amm.* 15.7. Pace Olszaniec (2013) Fl. Julius Leontius; Kuhoff (1983) 144; Bonfils (1981) 148; Chastagnol (1962) 149.

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II

The same holds true for his successor in the post of *comes Orientis*, Marcellinus, who is attested in this office by two laws issued on 3 October 349.⁴⁹ This Marcellinus may be identical with the Marcellinus recorded as governor of the province of Phoenice in 342.⁵⁰ The identification is likely, in that in this earlier office Marcellinus would have acquired knowledge of the region that made him a suitable candidate for the strategically important post of *comes Orientis*. Marcellinus is recorded as *praeses Phoenices*, rather than *consularis* like his two known predecessors in office, the senators Flavius Dionysius (discussed in [Chapter 2](#)) and Archelaus, but it is not necessary to assume that this indicates a downgrading of the province to equestrian rank. In the late 350s, when the senate in Constantinople was forcefully expanded, the province was an important recruiting ground for new senators ([Chapter 6](#)), so it is far more likely that this prestigious post remained senatorial throughout this period and that Marcellinus was a senator when he held it in 342. His background is unknown, so it is unclear whether he too belonged to a leading family in Rome. He certainly became an important figure in Constantius' regime and was part of the court that tried Photinus at Sirmium in 351, together with Flavius Leontius and several other important figures of Constantius' government.⁵¹ Another uncertain candidate is Archelaus, *consularis* of the province of Phoenice in 335 and perhaps *comes Orientis* in 340.⁵² His son would pursue a career at court under Valens in the East and both had close contacts with Libanius, so it is possible that Archelaus stemmed from a senatorial family from the East.⁵³

⁴⁹ *PLRE I*: 546 (Marcellinus 7).

⁵⁰ *PLRE I*: 545 (Marcellinus 6).

⁵¹ *PLRE I*: 503 (Leontius 22). On the judges at the trial of Photinus, see [Chapter 5](#), p. 179 n. 35. Hunt (1998) 17–20; Barnes (1993) 109–10, and Brennecke (1984) 91–107 discuss the trial in detail.

⁵² *PLRE I*: 100 (Archelaus 1). It is unclear whether this Archelaus should be identified with *PLRE I*: 101 (Flavius Archelaus 6), *vir clarissimus, comes* and *praeses Arabiae* in 349/50. If so, Archelaus, like Marcellinus, became an important figure in Constantius' eastern government.

⁵³ Son: *PLRE I*: 100 (Archelaus 3).

Other Roman senators can be identified in Constantius' eastern administration, for instance Lucius Caelius Montius, whose building works in Ephesus have already been cited.⁵⁴ Montius, proconsul of Asia from 349 to 350 (or 351), was accompanied by a legate, the *vir clarissimus* Caelius Januarianus, who was probably a relative.⁵⁵ Both are generally considered to have been new men recruited by Constantius in the eastern provinces.⁵⁶ This would have marked a clear break from centuries of tradition for such an important and prestigious governorship. However, upon closer examination their career becomes more complex: their names suggest that Montius and Januarianus were from a traditional western senatorial family – the Caelii – from (Latin) North Africa.⁵⁷ Montius' name, his language abilities⁵⁸ and the circumstances of his proconsulship in Asia in 349–50/1 hence suggest that the proconsul, much like other high-ranking senatorial officials of Constantius, was a member of the senate of Rome able to take up office in the East.⁵⁹

A further possible Roman candidate for the proconsulship of Asia under Constantius II is Clodius Celsinus *signo* Adelphius, the husband of the Christian poet Proba.⁶⁰ Adelphius was *corrector* in Italy before 333, and moved to Africa as *consularis Numidiae* between 333 and 337, prior to holding a proconsulship in an unknown province. A member of a powerful senatorial

⁵⁴ *PLRE* I: 608 (L. Caelius Montius) = 535 (Magnus 11); Olszaniec (2013) Lucius Caelius Montius.

⁵⁵ *PLRE* I: 452 (Januarianus 1). Perhaps his son: Olszaniec (2013) 285.

⁵⁶ Kuhoff (1982) 278–9; Bonfils (1981) 137; Malcus (1967) 141.

⁵⁷ Caelii in *PLRE* I: The first Caelius recorded is *PLRE* I: 835 (Caelius Severus *signo* Thoracius 21), a patrician *consularis* and patron of the *colonia Puppitanae* in Africa Proconsularis in 282. *PLRE* I: 196 (C. Caelius Censorius 2) started his senatorial career as *praetor candidatus* and concluded it as governor of Campania under Constantine; his grandson *PLRE* I: 196 (Censorius 1) was governor of Numidia in 375/8, probably in order to supervise his landed property there. In 377, *PLRE* I: 433 (Caelius Hilarianus 4) made a dedication to Magna Mater and Attis (*CIL* VI 500 = *ILS* 4148) and held several priesthoods in Rome (cult of Mithras and the cult of the Hecate), suggesting that Hilarianus belonged to one of the most important senatorial families of Rome.

⁵⁸ *Lib. Arg. D.* 1, dedicated to Montius in his proconsulship in Asia. On Montius' knowledge of the Latin language and culture rather than Greek, see Olszaniec (2013) 279.

⁵⁹ Western senatorial background, see also Noethlichs (1991) 1120.

⁶⁰ *PLRE* I: 192 (Celsinus 6) = 193 (Celsinus 7), 732 (Proba 2).

family, he then became urban prefect under Magnentius in 351. However, in this office Adelphius was accused by a certain Dorus of conspiring against Magnentius (perhaps working towards an alliance with Constantius), and was deposed from his office in Rome after a tenure of only seven months. His holding of the urban prefecture under Magnentius rebounded upon Adelphius and his family in subsequent years: his wife Proba is known to have written an account of Constantius' war against Magnentius, composed probably to exculpate her husband for his collaboration with the usurper.⁶¹ Given Adelphius' known posts, in Italy and Africa, and in view of the *cursus honorum* pursued by his predecessors in the Roman prefecture discussed so far, it is possible that his proconsulship was in Achaea or Asia and that Adelphius was a predecessor of Caelius Montius in Ephesus.⁶² If his office was that of the proconsulship in Asia, he would be another leading Roman senator in office under Constantius.

So far I have examined the careers of several Roman senators in office under Constantius who were from senatorial families from Rome or North Africa (the origin of the praetorian prefect Leontius being unknown). Now I turn to the careers of Roman senators from Greece, at this time within the sphere of Constans, the western emperor, men from senatorial families that rose to prominence under the Constantinian dynasty.

I begin with Ulpian Limenius, proconsul in Constantinople in 342 in the aftermath of violent urban turmoil (discussed in detail in [Chapter 4](#)). As this is his first attested office, Limenius is generally believed to have been an 'eastern' senator of Constantinople: André Chastagnol proposed that Limenius was a senator in Constantinople and that his later appointment in the West as urban prefect and praetorian prefect was a means of forcefully expanding the scope of the offices to be occupied by members of the senate in Constantinople.⁶³

⁶¹ *PLRE* I: 732 (Proba 2). On the political context of Proba's poem, see Bleckmann (1999a).

⁶² Note also that in this post Adelphius would have been able to attend to his landed interests in Asia, on which see Chausson (2016) 290–1.

⁶³ Chastagnol (1992) 259–62, (1962) 128–30 no. 50; also Maraval (2013) 181.

Along similar lines, Jill Harries has recently argued that the appointment of this ‘easterner’ in Rome reflects Constans’ personal preference for the Greek world and a deterioration of his difficult relationship with Rome.⁶⁴ However, Limenius’ *nomen* Ulpus in fact suggests that he was a member of the Roman aristocracy, scion of the traditional Roman senatorial family of Ulpus which originated in Greece.⁶⁵ The Ulpus appear to have done well under the Constantinian emperors: a certain Ulpus Flavianus was appointed by Constantine to the newly reformed post of *consularis* of Aemilia and Liguria in 323;⁶⁶ this officeholder is not known in more detail, yet given Constantine’s preference for senators from traditional aristocratic families, it is likely that this Flavianus was also a member of the Ulpus. If this is correct, Ulpus Limenius probably owed his position to the fact that his family were known as loyal supporters of the Constantinian regime. His proconsulship in Constantinople was the lowest ranking proconsulship,⁶⁷ but given the circumstances Constantius seems to have managed to convince this noble Roman senator to hold office there. Limenius seems to have met imperial expectations in this post and was later made urban prefect in Rome and praetorian prefect in the West in 349.⁶⁸

The next senator from Greece to hold office under Constantius is Limenius’ predecessor in Constantinople in 341, a man called Alexander. As Timothy Barnes has suggested, this Alexander was a native of Athens, where his son studied under the orator Himerius.⁶⁹ If so, he was a compatriot of another important

⁶⁴ Harries (2012) 190–2. See also Maraval (2013) 190; Piganiol (1971) 88; Chastagnol (1960) 416–17.

⁶⁵ *PLRE* I: 510 (Limenius 2); traditional senatorial family from Greece: Jacques (1986) 224. On Ulpus’ background and office in Rome, see also my discussion in Moser (2017) 44–5 and pp. 107–10 below.

⁶⁶ *CTh* 11.16.2, dated to 21 May 323; *PLRE* I: 349 (Flavianus 18). Together with the post of *corrector* of the provinces of Campania and of Flaminia et Picenum, Flavianus’ office had been upgraded to senatorial rank in around 320: Kuhoff (1983) 63–76.

⁶⁷ On the position of the new proconsulship in the administrative hierarchy: Malcus (1967) 151–2.

⁶⁸ *PLRE* I: 510 (Limenius 2).

⁶⁹ Barnes (1987a) with *PLRE* I: 40 (Alexander 3) and Groag (1946) 31.

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II

official, Scylacius. Scylacius' first position was an office at court, with either Constantius II or Constantine;⁷⁰ in 343 he was then appointed *vicarius* of Asiana,⁷¹ and was promoted to the pro-consulship in Achaea towards the end of the decade.⁷² Was Scylacius a senator by birth? This is not clear. It is possible that in Asia Scylacius was a senatorial *vicarius* (like Acindynus) rather than an equestrian, but the evidence for this office under Constantius is too scant to allow general conclusions about the rank of *vicarii* in this period.⁷³ However, Scylacius' Greek descent is well-documented: an inscription recording his building activities in Asia, notably the reconstruction of a public fountain in Laodicea on the Lycus, calls him *Aiakides*, meaning from Aegina.⁷⁴ This closely echoes a passage in a panegyric by Himerius to a homonymous proconsul of Achaea, which claims that Scylacius was descended from the Aeginetan hero Aeacus.⁷⁵ That this Scylacius is identical to the *vicarius* is confirmed by Himerius' reference to an earlier office in 'Ionia, of the Maeander' and to the suppression of brigands in Pisidia, two regions for which Scylacius was responsible during his Asian vicariate. It is thus not unlikely that Scylacius, like Alexander, belonged to a senatorial family from Greece: his high-ranking appointments indicate that he was educated in Greek and Latin, and Himerius' allusion to Scylacius' descent implies that, if not senatorial, Scylacius was certainly from one of the leading curial families of Aegina. What his career also reveals is that, contrary to what has been argued elsewhere, senatorial officials who had served under Constantius in the East could be appointed to posts in Constans' imperial realm in Greece.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ *PLRE* I: 811 (Scylacius 1) with Penella (2007) 207–8; Corsten (1997) 57–9 no. 18; Kuhoff (1983) 134–6; Martindale (1980) Scylacius.

⁷¹ *Him. Or.* 25.33, see Barnes (1987a) 215.

⁷² Kuhoff (1983) 135.

⁷³ Kuhoff (1983) 135 in favour of a senatorial *vicarius*; *pace* Nollé (2001) 489–90 with further refs for an equestrian.

⁷⁴ Corsten (1997) 57–9 no. 18.

⁷⁵ *Him. Or.* 25, 47 with Barnes (1987a) 215.

⁷⁶ *Contra*: Penella (2007) 208; Malcus (1967) 147 n. 1; Groag (1946) 34; arguing that officials of Constantius could not serve in Greece since this was (still) Constans' realm in 350.

To summarize the discussion so far: Roman senators were appointed to high senatorial office in the East under Constantius throughout this period (from 338, when Acindynus ruled the East as praetorian prefect, to the proconsul Caelius Montius, and the *comes Orientis* Leontius, recorded in office in 349). As under Constantine, many were from elite senatorial families from Rome (Acindynus, Placidus, Rufinus, Leontius), or long-serving senatorial families from Africa (Caelius Montius) or Greece (Ulpian Limenius). They were often appointed to rule over provinces, or given special roles at times when there was increased need to secure Constantius' authority (following the death of Constantine and Constantine II, or following urban unrest as in Constantinople).

I now turn to examine senators of eastern descent. I again proceed in a hierarchical order from the top echelons to less prestigious individuals. This list must begin with the two Anatolii, a successful family from Berytus.⁷⁷ The older Anatolius is well-known: he studied Roman law in Rome, a costly enterprise, which however gave him the chance to mix with the Roman political class. Thereafter he pursued a career in the West and was appointed praetorian prefect (of Illyricum), probably from 344 to 347.⁷⁸ Anatolius' study in Rome and his subsequent career already indicate that he was very wealthy. This is also suggested by an inscription from Perge, where a certain Hilarion is honoured by a statue set up by the city council of Perge, which introduces her as the wife of the great and honourable *euergetes* of Asia, Anatolius.⁷⁹ A possible explanation for erecting a statue to this noble woman is that Hilarion was of Pergean descent or that the couple were large landowners in the region, which would give Hilarion the opportunity to show generosity to the city. Either by marriage or acquisition, the family of Anatolius had thus been able to establish a highly

⁷⁷ For a revised discussion of the careers of the two Anatolii and dates of the offices they held: Porena (2003) 59; Bradbury (2000); Migl (1994) 102–7; Néri (1974).

⁷⁸ *Contra*: e.g. Moro (1996) 373, who dates the introduction of the prefecture of Illyricum to around 347.

⁷⁹ Şahin (2015) 179 no. 4 with an important comment by D. Feissel who, however, follows *PLRE I* and assumes that there was only one Anatolius.

diversified property portfolio, as was usual for large, and hence often senatorial, landholders in this period.⁸⁰ In addition, perhaps as a result of their wealth, Anatolius was also highly educated not only in Roman law: the inscription mentions Anatolius' *nomen gentilicium* Vinda(eo)nius, suggesting that, as Denis Feissel has remarked, the honoured prefect was also the homonymous author of a work called *Synagoge georgikon epitedeumatōn*.⁸¹ Given his literary interests, it comes as no surprise that during his term of office as praetorian prefect the elder Anatolius was actively involved in the traditional culture of Greece and with the Athenian orator Prohaeresius.⁸²

Anatolius' younger relative, also called Anatolius, managed to be appointed *consularis* of Syria Coele in 349; in 355 he too would become prefect of Illyricum, having declined the urban prefecture in Rome.⁸³ The wealth, education and careers of these two Anatolii strongly suggest that we are dealing with a senatorial family, an example of one of the many eastern families who had entered the Roman senate in previous the decades and centuries.⁸⁴ Indeed, the Anatolii were as powerful, wealthy and ambitious as some better known Roman senatorial clans such as the Anicii or the Aradii in Rome.⁸⁵

Far less distinguished, but still very successful was the career of a certain Flavius Philagrius from Cappadocia. As the first prefect of Egypt of senatorial rank (allegedly appointed at the demand of the Alexandrians), the former *rationalis* had probably overseen the collection of corn for Constantine's army during the preparations for Constantine's Persian campaigns in 335–7. Constantius reappointed him to the office in 338 to 340, perhaps because the intermittent holder of the office, Flavius Antonius Theodorus had proven unable to fulfil the tasks expected of him, perhaps because as a man

⁸⁰ Senatorial landholdings in the East: Boulay and Northrup (2016); Moser (2016b).

⁸¹ Photius, *Bibl.* 163, see Feissel's comment in Şahin (2015) 179 no. 4, and Boulay and Northrup (2016) 426.

⁸² Eun. *Vit.* 10.1.1–8.1, esp. 10.6.1–15.

⁸³ Lib. *Epp.* 391, 423.

⁸⁴ On the eastern senators in Rome, see Chausson (2016), Halfmann (2008), (2007), (1982), (1979).

⁸⁵ I discuss these families in Chapter 1, pp. 21–7, 30–4, 41–3.

of perfectissimate rank he did not have the necessary personal authority.⁸⁶ Philagrius then made him (senatorial) *vicarius* of Pontica from 348 to 350.⁸⁷ Philagrius was not a new member of the elite: as was usual for the sons of wealthy eastern families, he had studied in Athens, where he had met several other future major political players, including a future municipal councillor from Nicomedia.⁸⁸ In his position in northern Asia Minor his main duty was, again, to secure an effective administration in provinces that were of importance to the military logistics of the eastern front, namely the regions along the northern Persian and Armenian border.

At a hierarchical level below Philagrius, several eastern senators can be documented in the lower ranking provincial governorships around Antioch. To name a few, Theodorus, probably a Syrian – he may have been equestrian *praeses* in the province of Arabia earlier in his career – became the first recorded *consularis* of Syria Coele.⁸⁹ His successor Flavius Antonius Hierocles from Cilicia seems to have held a governorship in Arabia prior to his appointment in Syria, but was granted senatorial rank in his new post.⁹⁰ These careers testify to the success of wealthy curial families in advancing to senatorial rank through appointment to a governorship close to their place of origin.⁹¹ However, such local recruitment was not unusual at the time and not a purely eastern phenomenon. The ‘heimatnahe Verwendung von Verwaltern’ was a feature also of the minor senatorial provinces Byzacena and Numidia in Africa as well as of Campania in Italy.⁹² In the East, this rule evidently applied to the governorships in Syria Coele and Phoenice. These eastern senatorial governorships, suited to meet the heightened demand for strong government in Syria during

⁸⁶ *PLRE* I: 900 (Theodorus 22).

⁸⁷ *PLRE* I: 694 (Philagrius 5). Demand by Alexandrians: Greg. Naz. *Or.* 21.28.

⁸⁸ *Lib. Or.* 1.66.

⁸⁹ *PLRE* I: 896 (Theodorus 5) = 896 (Theodorus 6).

⁹⁰ *PLRE* I: 431 (Hierocles 3).

⁹¹ Davenport (2018).

⁹² Kuhoff (1983) 111. Indeed, while it was generally forbidden to hold office in one’s home province, there was the possibility of a special imperial *placet*: *CJ* 9.29.3, 380, see Delmaire (2013) 131–2.

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II

Constantius' Persian campaigns, were not perhaps prestigious enough to attract established Roman senators. Note, however, that this post was not used uniquely for new senators: the younger Anatolius is the last known *consularis* of Syria Coele in this period (in office in 349), and may have used the post to secure his landed interest in the region.⁹³

Men like the Anatolii and the other eastern senatorial officials may have looked down on the great majority of easterners in office under Constantius, who held posts in the equestrian administration, for instance as *praesides* in Arabia, Cilicia, Egypt, or Bithynia, or as governor of Egypt.⁹⁴ To name one notable example, the equestrian *praeses* of Pamphylia, Flavius Areianus Alypius, renovated the harbour facilities in Side sometime between 338 and 350 and was awarded a statue by the city.⁹⁵ After his Asian post, Alypius was made *comes* and appointed *praeses* in the province of Augustamnica, where he is recorded in a papyrus as διασημότατος κόμης καὶ ἡγεμών in 351 and 352.⁹⁶ Several other eastern equestrian *comites* of Constantius, such as Datianus, Musonianus, Taurus and Thalassius, are mentioned in the writings of the bishops who were involved in the ecclesiastical disputes of the time.⁹⁷ Constantius' *comites* presided over councils and trials or acted as messengers of the imperial court, on the orders of the emperor. Two of them, Musonianus and Datianus, were former *comites* of Constantine who joined the court of Constantius; according to Libanius, Datianus was for many years Constantius' 'Nestor'.⁹⁸ A similar continuity in service also characterizes the advancement of Flavius Philippus.

⁹³ On such strategic officeholding, see also Moser (2016b).

⁹⁴ See relevant lists in *PLRE* I: 1105–10.

⁹⁵ Nollé (1993) 347–51 no. 64; *PLRE* I: 49 (Alypius 12).

⁹⁶ 352: *P. Oxy.* 60 4091,9. Alypius is the last recorded equestrian governor in the province of Augustamnica, which, like many eastern provinces, was upgraded to a senatorial post (*vir consularis*) in 357, see Palme (1998) 134. I return to the upgrading of the province in Chapter 6, pp. 223–5.

⁹⁷ *PLRE* I: 243 (Datianus 1), 611 (Strategius Musonianus), 879 (Flavius Taurus), 886 (Thalassius 1).

⁹⁸ Lib. *Ep.* 114 (ὁ βασιλέως Νέστορ) with *PLRE* I: 243 (Datianus 1). See also Pietri (1989) 132.

Philippus had been a palatine official (*cura palatii*) under Constantine and continued his service under Constantius.⁹⁹ Philippus became Constantius' close associate and military consultant, perhaps already when he was Caesar, and was then appointed Constantius' praetorian prefect in 344.¹⁰⁰

My discussion of Constantius' senatorial officeholders has suggested that high-ranking posts in his eastern administration were often occupied by established Roman senators, scions of traditional Roman families, with origins in Rome, Africa or Greece. Some were of eastern origin, but still senators in Rome. This is revealed in particular by the careers of the Anatolii, who took up office in the West as praetorian prefects in Illyricum. Indeed, one Anatolius was even offered the urban prefecture of Rome, suggesting that he had close contacts with the Roman senatorial elite. What this means is that, contrary to what is often argued, Constantius ruled the East too with the support of the Roman senate. Thus we see that, like his father, Constantius capitalized on senatorial ambition to assert his position and enforce his rule in the East, and that social status remained a crucial requirement for appointment to important senatorial posts.

In line with this, some new senators can be documented, but only in lower ranking offices in the region of Antioch, which were perhaps not prestigious enough to attract established Roman senators. Importantly, even the known new senators were not new members of the elite: Theodorus and Antonius Hierocles had already served in equestrian governorships prior to their appointment to a senatorial post. They were thus not parvenus: though not senatorial by birth, they were leading members of the eastern elite. There seem to have been more chances for easterners to acquire a senatorial office in the East under Constantius than under Constantine, yet the available evidence suggests that even under Constantius' rule the most important posts still went to Roman senators, whereas most

⁹⁹ Feissel (2016).

¹⁰⁰ *PLRE* I: 696 (Philippus 7). I return to Philippus' career in a detailed discussion in Chapter 5, pp. 197–205.

easterners were active in the equestrian ranks of the administration, as had been the case under Constantine.

Harnessing Roman Senators

After this close-up analysis of the active involvement of Roman senators in the East under Constantius II, the next step is to investigate the state of the senatorial *cursus honorum* attached to Rome in this period. The continuous appointment of Roman senators in the East shows that the *cursus honorum* of Rome, which, as discussed, had been expanded by Constantine to include the senatorial posts in the East, remained in place (Appendix C). The praetorian and urban prefects are a case in point. In the early 340s these were the Roman senators Titianus in Gaul, and Placidus and Rufinus in Italy, Africa and Illyricum. Titianus had been proconsul of Asia under Constantine, who also made him consul in 337; under Constans, he then advanced to the prefecture of Rome from 339 to 341, when he was appointed to the praetorian prefecture in Gaul, a post he held for nine years until the usurpation of Magnentius in 350.¹⁰¹ The distinguished Placidus, who was *comes Orientis* under Constantius between 340 and 342, became praetorian prefect in Italy from 342 to 344; in 346 he rose to the urban prefecture in Rome.¹⁰² Also appointed to a prefecture under Constans was the distinguished former *comes Orientis* Rufinus.¹⁰³ As praetorian prefect, Rufinus first held authority over the joint prefecture of Italy and Africa in 344–7, when he was transferred to the prefecture of Illyricum, a post he held until 352.¹⁰⁴ These officeholders are hence following the example set by Albinus or Proculus under Constantine.¹⁰⁵

Of particular importance in this context is the appointment of the former proconsul in Constantinople, Ulpius Limenius,

¹⁰¹ *PLRE* I: 918 (Titianus 6) with Chastagnol (1962) 107–11 no. 43.

¹⁰² *PLRE* I: 705 (Placidus 2). On Placidus the prefect: Barnes (1992) 255.

¹⁰³ *PLRE* I: 782 (Rufinus 25) with Migl (1994) 109–18; Kuhoff (1983) 244–5; Vogler (1979) 115–23.

¹⁰⁴ I return to Rufinus' political influence under Constantius in Chapter 5, pp. 178–9.

¹⁰⁵ *PLRE* I: 37 (Albinus 14), 747 (Proculus 11). See Appendix B.

to the praetorian prefecture of Italy and Africa in 347–9, and that of his successor Hermogenes, who is recorded in this post from 19 May 349 to 27 February 350, whom I have discussed elsewhere.¹⁰⁶ Both are often believed to have been eastern senators. I have already shown that this argument does not hold for Limenius, and it should be rejected also in the case of Hermogenes: this Hermogenes was, I suggest, a relative of the senator Aurelius Hermogenes, proconsul in Asia between 286 and 305, and urban prefect from 309 to 310 (see [Appendix A](#)). This identification would align well with the general pattern of appointment of urban prefects in this period which, as seen above, reveals a preference for men from established senatorial families, as was the case under Constantine ([Appendix B](#)).¹⁰⁷ The great majority of praetorian and urban prefects in this decade had previously held high-ranking posts in the eastern administration: at the end of their term of office, continuing a pattern established by Constantine, these Roman senators then returned to the West to continue their career in the key offices in the Western administration under Constans' authority. Limenius and Hermogenes fit the pattern very neatly ([Appendix C](#)).

However, there is an apparent oddity that needs to be discussed in detail: Limenius and Hermogenes, unlike their predecessors, or indeed their successors, were both urban prefect and praetorian prefect (of Italy).¹⁰⁸ In the Theodosian Code, Limenius is recorded only as praetorian prefect, but a law that requires him to collaborate closely with the pontiffs and mentions judges of regions (rather than provinces, as would be usual) securely places Limenius in Rome, which will have been his seat of office.¹⁰⁹ Why then is this law addressed to him as praetorian prefect? The conjunction of the urban prefecture with the prefecture of Italy, which is believed to have subjected the urban prefect to the provincial administration, and the appointment of an eastern senator to this post are often seen as evidence of the problematic relationship of Constans with

¹⁰⁶ *PLRE* I: 510 (Limenius 2) and 423 (Hermogenes 2) with Moser (2017) 44–5.

¹⁰⁷ *PLRE* I: 424 (Hermogenes 8).

¹⁰⁸ *PLRE* I: 510 (Limenius 2).

¹⁰⁹ *CTh* 9.17.2 (349).

Rome.¹¹⁰ However, another explanation is possible: Joachim Migl attractively suggested that Limenius was urban prefect of Rome while also holding certain responsibilities of a praetorian prefect, in an arrangement comparable to that of the Constantinian urban prefects, who also supervised the *vicarii* with oversight over the southern diocese of Italy.¹¹¹ Limenius' actual duties on the ground may thus not have differed from those of earlier urban prefects, but he now also bore the title of praetorian prefect of Italy. In that case, it is possible that Limenius' administrative realm included Rome, but also the southern diocese of Italy and, probably, Africa.¹¹² This reconstruction aligns well with the administrative arrangement in northern Italy at the time. Here, Vulcacius Rufinus, already discussed above, was in office as praetorian prefect of Italy from 344 to 347 and praetorian prefect of Illyricum from 346/7 to 351. As his realm of authority from 346 onwards cannot be securely defined, it is possible that he administered both the prefecture of Illyricum and the northern part of Italy, which would also explain why he was honoured by the people of Ravenna in 347.¹¹³ He could thus have ruled over those parts of Italy that were not covered by Limenius' authority.

Together, Limenius' and very probably Hermogenes' administrative and jurisdictional authority thus covered both Rome (and its senate) and the regions in which Roman senators traditionally held the majority of their landed wealth.¹¹⁴ Why was this arrangement put in place? Limenius' unusually comprehensive administrative authority may have owed much to the eleven hundredth anniversary of the founding of Rome in 347/8. For this event it may have seemed suitable to underline Rome's importance by investing its urban prefect with

¹¹⁰ E.g. Harries (2012) 190–2.

¹¹¹ Chapter 1, pp. 39–40.

¹¹² On the urban prefects in this decade: Migl (1994) 108–15; Chastagnol (1960) 415–19. *Contra*: Vogler (1979) 123–30, who restricts Limenius' authority to Italy, suggesting that Africa was governed by Eugenius, Constans' former *magister officiorum*, but this ignores Limenius' title, which includes Africa, and there is also no evidence for Eugenius in Africa (his title *ex-praefecto praetorio* seems to have been honorary, see *PLRE* I: 292 (Eugenius 5)).

¹¹³ *ILS* 1237, see Migl (1994) 108–9, 115.

¹¹⁴ Jones (1964) 2: 689–90; Lançon (2000) 62–4; Matthews (1975) 12–17.

administrative oversight in Italy and Africa, and, likewise, to appoint a member of a traditional Roman senatorial family, Ulpian Limenius, to the post.

The careers of Limenius and other Roman senators reveal that Roman senators continued to hold high office in the East under Constantius, and that these posts were an important step towards higher honours in the West, as urban prefects in Rome or praetorian prefects under Constans. What this means is that Constantius, too, furthered the careers of these Roman senators, with the implication that he considered himself emperor also of Rome and its senate. This is confirmed by a study of the consular appointments in this period: it reveals that the nomination of ordinary consuls remained the rightful concern of both emperors.¹¹⁵ Even the problems posed by the consular year of 344 can be resolved. Three consuls are recorded for this year: Fl. Domitius Leontius, Fl. Bonosus and Fl. Sallustius. Bonosus was listed as second consul in the West until April/May, when his name was replaced by that of Sallustius. In eastern documents, however, Bonosus was never recorded as consul, but only Sallustius. Scholars have hence argued that the appearance of Bonosus in documents from Constans' administration points to a break in the relationship between the emperors.

However, as Benet Salway has demonstrated, this mistaken consular dating can easily be explained without reference to a strained imperial relationship. By identifying Bonosus with the *magister equitum* attested in office under Constantius in 347, it is possible to conclude that the nomination of Bonosus in 344 was an unintended error: Constans' court proclaimed as consul the wrong *magister militum* of Constantius – not the *magister peditum* Sallustius but the *magister equitum* Bonosus – and it took a few months for the westerners to realize their mistake, which explains the appearance of three consuls in 344.¹¹⁶ In 2012 David Woods offered a slightly modified explanation, pointing to the possibility that Constantius

¹¹⁵ Salway (2008) 301, and more generally also Cuneo (2001) 169–71.

¹¹⁶ Salway (2008) 302–9.

had first nominated Bonosus for the consulship in 344, but then ‘suddenly decided to prefer Sallustius to Bonosus as his choice for *consul posterior* as a reward for Sallustius’ success in the recent eastern campaign when it was already too late to communicate this change of mind to Constans’ administration in time for the new year’.¹¹⁷

The data analysed in this section hence indicate that Constantius still acted as emperor of the senatorial aristocracy of Rome. He appointed them to high office in the East, and also participated in the election of consuls. In addition, imperial legislation reveals that he also attended to their financial interests where possible: Constantius ordered his praetorian prefect Philippus (in office from 344 onwards) to observe the fiscal privileges of senators who owned vast estates in various province in the East: *senatorum substantias, quas in diuersis locis et prouinciis possident*.¹¹⁸ The Roman senators who bought landed property in the East and in particular around Antioch, such as the buyer of Libanius’ land, if he was indeed a Roman senator, and other officials of Constantius who are accused by Julian of purchasing property in Antioch, will have approved.¹¹⁹ Indeed, Constantius continuously invested in maintaining his hold on Rome and rallying senatorial interest in his eastern empire. This is suggested by coinage minted in Rome following the death of Constantine, which presented Constantius as the legitimate successor of Constantine by appealing to the memory of Constantine, but also by later emissions showing the emblem of Constantius’ eastern empire, Constantinople.¹²⁰

In order to maintain a close link with Rome, Constantius also relied on a tool already used by his father: the new comital honours. Like Constantine, Constantius continued the practice of using lower ranking imperial *comites* for special unofficial missions: men like Musonianus and Datianus lacked

¹¹⁷ Woods (2012), quotation at 897.

¹¹⁸ *CJ* 12.1.4. On the fiscal privileges and dispersed landownership of senators in the East, see my discussion of property and power in the senate of Constantinople in Moser (2016b).

¹¹⁹ Chapter 4, pp. 124–6.

¹²⁰ Memory of Constantine: *RIC* VIII Rome 1, 1A discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 161–2; Constantinople: Chapter 4, pp. 119, 164–5.

senatorial rank, but their closeness to the emperor nonetheless granted them and their missions the prestige necessary to succeed. However, and importantly, he invited noble Roman senators to reside at his court and take part in government. Two senatorial *comites* at the court of Constantius in Antioch are known, both senators from Rome. One is Vulcacius Rufinus, whom I have already discussed. The other is Flavius Polemius, who composed the *Itinerarium Alexandri*, a panegyric of Constantius' eastern campaigns, which compared the young emperor to Alexander the Great.¹²¹ Robin Lane Fox identified him with the Roman senator Flavius Julius Valerius Alexander Polemius, consul in 338.¹²²

It is not known when Polemius first attended the court of Constantius in Antioch; the panegyric was probably written in 340.¹²³ He will still have been at court in 345/6 when he wrote to Athanasius on behalf of the emperor. Contrary to Timothy Barnes and Giovanni de Bonfils, I suggest that the involvement of Polemius in this dispute does not show that he was a Christian,¹²⁴ but reveals rather that he was a key senatorial supporter of Constantius, who used this distinguished senator (who was, his writings suggest, well-acquainted with traditional pagan cult practices)¹²⁵ to promote his imperial interests. Constantius probably hoped that a letter from a grand Roman aristocrat might impress Athanasius enough to persuade him to accept Constantius' demands. At any rate, Polemius' interest in Constantius' prospective military exploits in Persia is remarkable, and suggests that he may have had military responsibilities under Constantius.¹²⁶

¹²¹ On comparisons of Constantius II with Alexander the Great, and with Constantine, who sought to evoke the same analogy on his coinage, see [Chapter 4](#). On this 'Alexander literature', see more generally Cameron (2011) 560–4.

¹²² *PLRE I*: 710 (Polemius 4) = 709 (Polemius 3), see Lane Fox (1997). Barnes (2011) 197, 221 n. 39 and Maraval (2013) 65 agree on the identity of the author and the date of 340. See also *RE X.1* (Kroll) 846–50, s.v. 520 Iulius Valerius Polemius.

¹²³ Lane Fox (1997) 240.

¹²⁴ Barnes (1989a) 313–14; Bonfils (1981) 116.

¹²⁵ Lane Fox (1997) 246–7.

¹²⁶ Lane Fox (1997) 247 stretches the argument a little too far in suggesting Polemius was a general.

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II

This panegyric furnishes some important glimpses of the maintenance of the relationship between Constantius and Rome. Polemius praises Constantius for defending 'Roman safety' on the Persian front.¹²⁷ The reference is to the empire in general rather than the city of Rome, but perhaps there was a notion that his endeavours on the eastern front also furthered the interests of the Roman aristocracy more broadly; this was certainly the case in the early part of his reign, when several leading Roman senators can be documented in office in Syria. It is probable that the panegyrics circulated in Roman senatorial circles, brought there by an official senatorial embassy to the court of Constantius, or one of his senatorial supporters in Antioch; they would serve to commemorate Constantius' close relationship to the Roman senators who served him in Antioch, including Acindynus, Rufinus and Polemius, while at the same time cementing the link between Rome and Constantius, and kindling Rome's interest in Constantius' eastern rule.

Why this investment in the senators of Rome? The continuous appointment of Roman senators in the East suggests that Roman senators remained an important source of political legitimacy in this period. This is also implied by Constans' appointment policy at this time. Indeed, it is possible that the brother emperors engaged in rivalry for senatorial support in this period.

Imperial Competition over Rome?

Constans is conventionally believed to have had a dysfunctional relationship with Rome.¹²⁸ The question is complex,¹²⁹ but what matters here is that, in terms of career prospects, Constans' rule was a golden era for Roman senators. Most of his praetorian prefects came from their ranks: his appointees include Maecilius Hilarianus, Titianus, Lollianus, Aconius Catullinus, Placidus and Ulpius Limenius, all distinguished

¹²⁷ Lane Fox (1997) 248.

¹²⁸ Most recently Harries (2012) 189–96.

¹²⁹ Moser (2017); Harries (2012) 189–96; Callu (1992) 55–61.

members of the Roman senatorial aristocracy. During their long careers all of them were also appointed to the urban prefecture of Rome and granted the honour of a consulship.¹³⁰

In turn, while Roman senators pursued stellar careers under this emperor, life in Rome and its senate, it would seem, had become ever more competitive. Long periods of inactivity between appointments do not contradict this conclusion, but point rather to the difficulty for an individual senator or a senatorial camp in sustaining imperial support over an extensive period of time.¹³¹ Against this background Constantius II, who seems to have been less caught up in these power games in Rome, must have looked like an attractive alternative source of imperial support for career advancement, and our study has suggested that he was used as such. This implies competition between Constans and Constantius II for senatorial support, which prompted both emperors to pursue senator-friendly appointment policies.

The existence of such imperial competition for the senators of Rome is perhaps also implied by Constans' interest in mainland Greece. This was an important region for senatorial concerns. As we have seen, several of Constantius' senatorial governors were from the Greek peninsula: his first proconsul in Constantinople in 341, Alexander, seems to have been a member of a leading, perhaps senatorial, family from Athens;¹³² a similar background may be hypothesized for Scylacius from Aegina (*vicarius* of Asiana in 343 and then, towards the end of that decade, proconsul of Achaëa) and Ulpus Limenius (second proconsul in Constantinople and later urban and praetorian prefect in Rome).¹³³ Finally, Constantius' praetorian prefect from 338 to 340, the Roman senator Septimius Acindynus, married into a family of high standing from Greece. But the presence of men from Greece was not restricted to the administration of Constantius, as is

¹³⁰ *PLRE* I: 433 (Hilarianus 5), 918 (Titianus 6), 512 (Lollianus 5), 187 (Catullinus 3), 510 (Limenius 2), 705 (Placidus), see [Appendix C](#).

¹³¹ Ceconi (1996).

¹³² Barnes (1987a) with *PLRE* I: 40 (Alexander 3) and Groag (1946) 31.

¹³³ *PLRE* I: 811 (Scylacius 1), 510 (Limenius 2), discussed on pp. 99–101, 107–10 above.

The Senatorial Officials of Constantius II

revealed by the later career of Ulpian Limenius, which saw him appointed in 348 to the urban prefecture in Rome with administrative oversight also over southern Italy (and probably Africa). Constans' administration also abounded in men from Greece: his first praetorian prefect, Antonius Marcellinus, seems to have come from a leading family – *illustris familiae* – from Greece.¹³⁴ His granddaughter Melania is known to have owned property in Greece.¹³⁵ Furthermore, Constans' famous *magister officiorum* Flavius Eugenius, who, according to a later honorary inscription re-erected in Rome in the mid-350s, spent a long career at court, first as *magister admissionum* in 342, then as *magister officiorum* until his death in 349, when he was consul designate for 350, also had a close relationship with Greece: in a speech from 362 Libanius reports that Eugenius had married into a wealthy family from Corinth that had produced a senator in Rome under Constantine, Menander.¹³⁶ Evidently, since the incorporation of the Greek peninsula into the realm of Constantine in the late 310s, the elites of Greece managed to play an important role in the government of its emperors. (The same process can be followed further east, as I noted in my discussion of Constantius' senatorial supporters around Antioch.) It had also become an important location for senatorial property.¹³⁷

Perhaps as a result of this, Constans, or rather his officials, invested heavily in the (religious) infrastructure of Greece, as a group of five imperial statues from Delphi reveals.¹³⁸ They also fostered its cultural facilities; for instance Constans' praetorian prefect Anatolius organized a contest of rhetors in

¹³⁴ *PLRE* I: 548 (Marcellinus 16) = 545 (Marcellinus 5) = 549 (Marcellinus 22), see Barnes (1982) 164.

¹³⁵ *PLRE* I: 592 (Melania 1).

¹³⁶ *PLRE* I: 292 (Eugenius 5); *Lib. Or.* 14.10.

¹³⁷ On opportunities for Roman senators to acquire land at Antioch, see my discussion of Libanius' property in [Chapter 4](#), pp. 125–6.

¹³⁸ *LSA* 928 (U. Gehr) = *SIG* 1982, 903; *LSA* 927 (U. Gehr) = *SIG* 1982, 903 A; *LSA* 929 (U. Gehr) = *AE* 1948, 50; *LSA* 930 (U. Gehr) = *SEG* 22, 469 = *SIG* 1982, 903 D; *LSA* 1077 (U. Gehr) = *SIG* 1982, 897. I discuss this dynastic display under Constans in the ancient sanctuary of Delphi in Moser (2016a) 1238–40.

Athens during his prefectureship.¹³⁹ Finally, Constans in 342 restored to Athens the rhetor and teacher Prohaeresius, who had been exiled for an unknown reason some time between 337 and 340.¹⁴⁰ His career is narrated in great detail by the fragmentary fourth-century historian Eunapius. According to Eunapius, the emperor summoned Prohaeresius to court in Trier, where he was even granted the honour of sitting at the emperor's table, and invited to deliver speeches in front of the emperor and his entourage.¹⁴¹ After a couple of months in Trier, Prohaeresius was allowed to return to Athens. However, and most strikingly of all, Constans first sent him to Rome, to show the Romans the kind of learned men he ruled over.¹⁴² Obliging, Rome set up a bronze statue to the great rhetor. Finally, when Prohaeresius returned to Athens, with him came an imperial grant of corn from three islands, which would henceforth supply Athens alone with grain; Prohaeresius, who had obtained this favour from Constans, also acquired for himself the role of supervisor of the new grain supply. Such direct involvement on the part of Constans in the affairs of his proconsuls of Achaëa was unusual, but, it would seem, effective: in Rome Constans had been able to parade both his intellectual credentials and his influence and interest in Greece, while he left a mark on Greece and in particular Athens as a powerful and not so distant emperor.¹⁴³ In so doing he may perhaps have kindled Athenian memories of his father's relationship with the city. Two decades earlier Constantine had accepted the title of *strategos* from the city and had supported the torchbearer of the Eleusian Mysteries, Nicagoras, in travelling to Egypt;¹⁴⁴ in turn, the city of Athens had erected a

¹³⁹ On Vinda(eo)nius Anatolius the Elder, see my discussion above, pp. 102–3.

¹⁴⁰ My discussion of Prohaeresius' visit to Trier and his return to Athens via Rome owes much to Watts (2006) 60–1.

¹⁴¹ Watts (2006) 60.

¹⁴² I discuss Prohaeresius' visit to Rome and its role in the relation between Constans and Rome in more detail in Moser (2017) 50–1.

¹⁴³ On this and the later career of Prohaeresius in Athens also under Julian, see Watts (2006) 60–78.

¹⁴⁴ *Strategos*: Jul. Or. 1.8c. Nicagoras was a member of the Kerykes family, one of the most distinguished Athenian families, torchbearers of the mysteries of

dynastic monument to Constantine and his Caesars, which was updated several times when imperial events demanded, such as at the death of Dalmatius and that of Constantine II.¹⁴⁵ This Greek policy of Constans may have been consciously directed against Constantius II, who was deprived of such acts of patronage in this region.

Conclusion

I have argued that during the joint reign of the sons of Constantine from 337 to 350 the eastern emperor Constantius was not cut off from access to Rome. On the contrary, he fostered a close relationship with the Roman senate. Following the example of his father and many earlier emperors, he appointed leading Roman senators to high office in the eastern provinces and at court, where he also made them his *comites*. Roman aristocrats thus remained a key political and administrative pillar of imperial rule also in the East; the central role played by some of them, such as Acindynus, Limenius and Polemius, in the maintenance of Constantius' rule is a powerful reminder of the unity of the empire under Constans and Constantius in this respect, and of the importance of the traditional senatorial elite for the maintenance of Constantius' position in the East. There were also some senators with eastern origins. Depending on their prestige, these could rise to high office in

Eleusis, and known for their interest in education; many of them were themselves teachers, which perhaps explains why he married off his daughter to the orator Himerius: *PLRE* I: 627 (Nicagoras 1) and Barnes (2011) Appendix E. On Constantine's investments in Greece and in particular Athens, see Deligiannakis (2005); Sironen (2001), (1994); Frantz (1988) 16–17. Perhaps in return for his interest in the city, Constantine was also honoured with a panegyric by the Athenian Praxagoras, who is recorded by Photius, a ninth-century patriarch of Constantinople, to have written a eulogizing account that covered Constantine's rise to sole power. On Praxagoras' *Life of Constantine*, see the discussion in Barnes (2011) 195–7, with an English trans. of Photius' summary of the work. Photius records that Praxagoras was 21 when he wrote this speech. If that is correct, then the *Life of Constantine* must date from 332/3, and was hence perhaps written to coincide with the festivities in late 333 (and not 330, as Barnes, 2011, 197, suggests). Praxagoras later composed a work in honour of Constantius II, the *Life of Alexander*, discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 162–4.

¹⁴⁵ *LSA* 399, 400, 402 (U. Gehr) = *JG II/III*² 13269, 13270a–c, d, 13271; Sironen (2001), see also Moser (2016a) 1237.

this period, like their counterparts from Greece and Africa. New senators, by contrast, had to content themselves with lower ranking provincial governorships (for instance around Antioch). Most notably, where they are known, the careers of the senators from this period suggest that they progressed on the *cursus honorum* attached to Rome, taking up high office in the West after appointment in the East. There is no evidence of a separate *cursus honorum* in the East.

As a result, Constantius invested in a cordial relationship with Rome: he was involved in the consular appointments and appointed senators to comital honours at his court. He also advertised his eastern empire in coinage in Rome and fostered literary productions praising his eastern achievements (and, implicitly, the involvement of Roman senators in them). Finally, the fact that the Roman senators had two emperors whom they could petition for patronage may in turn have shaped imperial policies towards them, as is also indicated by Constantius' appointment policies. Notable is Constantius' involvement in Greece, which may have responded to imperial competition for support from Rome. The existence of two emperors allowed for competition between them, a possibility that may also explain the emergence of the urban prefecture with authority over southern Italy. Against this background, the consular appointments reveal imperial attempts to manage this complex situation as smoothly as possible: both emperors had their due share in selecting candidates for the slots to be awarded. To conclude, during the 340s Constantius ruled with the support of the Roman senate and remained, at least in this respect, emperor of Rome and its senate, and the empire remained a unified one.

CHAPTER 4

REMEMBERING CONSTANTINE IN ANTIOCH AND CONSTANTINOPLE

Probably to coincide with his *vicennalia* between 344 and 346, Constantius issued a new series of gold coins, showing on the reverse *Roma* and *Constantinopolis* side by side, surrounded by the legend *GLORIA REIPUBLICAE* (Figure 4.1).¹ In this twin-city motif, *Constantinopolis* appeared as on a par with Rome, both holding a sceptre, the symbol of imperial rule, in their hands.² The emblematic pairing of Rome and Constantinople on one coin motif has been used to argue that Constantius promoted Constantinople and its senate to be a rival to Rome.³ This seems to be supported by ample evidence confirming that several measures were taken in this period to raise the status of the city and its senate, including the introduction of a pro-consul;⁴ Constantius also invested extensively in its urban fabric and educational facilities. However, my investigation of the careers of the senators employed in Constantius' eastern administration in Chapter 3 has suggested that high office in the East continued to be held by Roman senators; by contrast, the few new eastern senators attested are documented in the region of Antioch, where his court was based in this period. In light of these results I propose to review Constantius'

¹ *RIC* VIII Antioch 83. Seeck (1898) 60–5 wrongly argues that the twin-city type solidus in 339 was produced shortly after Constans had transferred Thrace (including Constantinople) into Constantius' imperial domain. The motif was used on *vota* coinage, so Maraval (2013) 178, Dagron (1974) 50, and Toynbee (1947) 138 date this type to 343/4, the year when Constantius would have celebrated his *vicennalia* as Caesar, while Pietri (1989) 128 argues for 342. Kent in *RIC* VIII 39–40 dates the coin series to after 346.

² Toynbee (1947) 138–9. On the Tyche of Constantinople under Constantine: Lenski (2015); Ntantalía (2001); Toynbee (1947) 138–9; Alföldi (1947) 16.

³ Alföldi (1947) 16.

⁴ Skinner (2008).

Ruling the East (AD 337–350)



FIGURE 4.1 Solidus, (a) obverse depicting Constantius II with a diadem, (b) reverse showing the enthroned representations of Rome and Constantinople (Roma and Constantinopolis) with the legend *GLORIA REI PVBLICAE*. MK RÖ 35947.

By permission of KHM, Wien.

investments in Constantinople and gauge the evidence for the promotion of a second senate in this period.

In the remainder of the chapter I will make the case that Constantius' widely advertised commitment to Constantinople was a way of using his father's city as a basis to claim legitimacy and the senior position among the brother emperors; this policy was also based on the fact he had been raised to the imperial throne in this city in 324, when his father appointed him Caesar on the occasion of the city's refoundation as Constantinople.⁵

The first section of the chapter investigates Constantius' relationship with Antioch. The evidence reveals that his continuous presence here brought significant advantages to the city and its elites; it thus completes the study of Constantius' senatorial officials in [Chapter 3](#), which suggested that Antioch became the hub for eastern senatorial ambition in this period. The rest of the chapter then investigates the role of Constantinople in Constantius' rule. The second section, 'Promoting Constantinople', reviews Constantius'

⁵ Raised in Constantinople: *Lib. Or.* 59.17–55; *Them. Or.* 4.58a; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 41.11.

Remembering Constantine

investments in the city, the introduction of a proconsul, and the improvements of urban and teaching facilities there. The third section, ‘Praetorships in Constantinople’ then reconsiders evidence for a senate. It looks in detail at the so-called praetorships in Constantinople, as documented in imperial legislation (*CTh* 6.4.5–6) and in literary evidence for its nature and character. As will be shown, the evidence does not support the argument that there was an imperial senate in Constantinople in this period. The next two sections of the chapter offer an explanation for Constantius’ continuous commitment to the development of Constantinople. I suggest that it should be explained with reference to his use of the memory of Constantine as a means of displaying his filial piety and imperial success in order to bolster his imperial position first against his co-ruling brothers between 337 and 340 (‘Rewriting Imperial Funerals’) and then as senior Augustus in the joint reign with Constans (‘Good Son and Senior Augustus’). At the end of this section, I suggest that in this context Constantinople was turned into a symbol of Constantius’ imperial glory also by repeated imperial visits to the city to mark important imperial occasions. Altogether, this chapter delineates the use of Constantinople as a symbol of Constantius’ claim to (senior) imperial power in this period.

Antioch

This first section looks at Constantius’ relationship with Antioch and its elites between 337 and 350, when Constantius was resident in this city due to his ongoing commitments on the Persian front.⁶ Imperial legislation and other evidence locates Constantius in Antioch during much of the winter and on campaign in the East during the summers of these years.⁷ In this period the Syrian capital thus became the political centre

⁶ Constantius’ Persian campaigns up to 350 are narrated in e.g. *Jul. Or.* 1. 17b–29d, *Lib. Or.* 59.59–120; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 42.20; *Festus Brev.* 27; *Eutrop.* 10.10; *Zos.* 2.41.1, *Malal.* 13.17, discussed in Maraval (2013) 64–79; Potter (2004) 467–71; Hunt (1998) 11–14; Isaac (1998); Portmann (1989).

⁷ For Constantius’ movements in this period, see Destephen (2016) 45–8, 357–9; Pfeilschifter (2013) 42 n. 3; Barnes (1993) 219–20; and Seeck (1919) 188–97.

of the Roman East.⁸ Embassies and those seeking high office went to Antioch to present their petitions to the emperor, and it was here that Constantius gathered several Roman senators as *comites* at court (Polemios, Rufinus), and in high government positions (the *comes Orientis* Placidus and the praetorian prefect Acindynus). The role of these men was like that of the Proculi and Madaliani under Constantine: connecting the emperor with the senate in Rome.⁹ Antioch profited greatly from the presence of Constantius and his court, in the first instance through infrastructure and building projects. Reflections of his stay in the city have come down in coinage and in literary sources, notably Julian's *Misopogon* and Libanius' *Antiochos*, written in 356. Other sources, mostly Christian, report Constantius' church buildings, while the *Expositio totius mundi et gentium* sketches his investments in the infrastructure of Antioch and its harbour. They reveal that Constantius invested heavily in its cultural and economic amenities. On 6 January 341 he inaugurated the Golden Church; its construction had begun under Constantine, but parts of the building works had perhaps already involved Constantius, who had been stationed in Antioch as Constantine's Caesar from at least 335.¹⁰ The construction of such a church was an important achievement and probably the young Augustus' first celebration of the conclusion of major public building, so it is not surprising that expert orators travelled across the empire to praise his impressive new construction.¹¹ Constantius also improved the facilities of both Antioch's main harbour at Seleucia and that at nearby Laodicea, two ports that were vitally important to the logistical infrastructure of his ongoing eastern campaigns.¹²

⁸ On Antioch in late antiquity more generally, see e.g. Shepardson (2014); Cribiore (2007); Sandwell (2007); Sandwell and Huskinson (2004); Campbell (1988); Liebeschuetz (1972); Downey (1963), (1961).

⁹ Constantine's eastern senatorial policies are discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, those of Constantius in Chapter 3.

¹⁰ Athan. *De Syn.* 25.1, Hil. *De Syn.* 25.33, and Soc. 2.15, but not Malal. *Chron.* 13.17, see Woods (2005).

¹¹ Henck (2001) 295–7; Malosse (2001a) 91. The orator is Bemarchius of Constantinople: *PLRE* I: 160 (Bemarchius).

¹² *Exp. tot. mundi* 27–8 with Rougé (1966). Several inscriptions that record the maintenance of harbours in the eastern Mediterranean in this period reveal that their

Remembering Constantine

Many other buildings, including porticoes and fountains, were constructed in Constantius' name and from public funds. They were carried out by his officials, including his close supporter Datianus, who is known to have built two baths, a portico, a villa and gardens in Antioch.¹³ The future praetorian prefect Anatolius greatly embellished the city as *consularis Syriae* in late 349.¹⁴ Archaeological surveys show that Constantius' administration also repaired baths and the theatre at nearby Daphne.¹⁵ These building activities are reflected in the literary sources but also in imperial legislation: a law of 344 sent to Constantius' praetorian prefect Leontius, based in Antioch, reveals that there was a shortage of architects, engineers and surveyors of buildings and aqueducts. Leontius is told to encourage these professionals to enjoy their (fiscal) privileges and take on pupils to secure continuity and satisfy demand.¹⁶

There were many other advantages for Antioch in Constantius' presence. Besides these improvements in infrastructure and urban amenities, Antiocheans enjoyed a thriving entertainment scene under this emperor. According to the author of the *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, Constantius' presence alone explained why Antioch could offer so many different kinds of amenities, most of all in its circus.¹⁷ Similarly, in 363 and after falling out with the populace of Antioch, Julian claimed that his presence and his sober public appearances were a sharp contrast to the reign of Constantius, who had enjoyed games in the circus, theatre and dance: the age of Constantius, so Julian complained, had been an age of esprit and youth.¹⁸ It is to be expected that many of the manifold

improvement was a centrally planned policy encompassing works at Laodicea ad Mare: Aliquot (2010); Side: Nollé (1993) no. 49; Corinth: *IG IV* 209; and Myra: *CIL III* 12126+7. On these maritime improvements, see Moser (2014), which notes that the guarantee of regular shipments of grain (from Egypt: *Exp. tot. mundi* 36) for the food rations of the soldiers was a particular worry (e.g. *CTh* 8.4.6).

¹³ *PLRE I*: 243 (Datianus 1).

¹⁴ For Anatolius' career, see [Chapters 3 and 6](#) and Bradbury (2000). Embellishments: *Lib. Ep.* 114, 441.

¹⁵ Petit (1955) 315 with a list of recorded construction works in Antioch under Constantius II, and also Henck (2001) 293–7.

¹⁶ *CTh* 13.4.3.

¹⁷ *Exp. tot. mundi* 32.

¹⁸ *Jul. Misop.* 339d–340a, 357d–358a.

entertainments he lists in his account of Constantius' engagement with the city were funded by the emperor himself. Others were staged by the municipal councillors, as part of their liturgies to the municipal council, or on their own account in order to further their reputation. Here too the emperor was often involved: the letters of Libanius reveal that Constantius often had to assist in procuring wild animals and other supplies for these games.¹⁹ Sometimes the councillors gave games in the name of their underage sons, as in the case of the wealthy *curialis* Obodianus, who held chariot races for his son Argyrius in 349, having already performed a liturgy in relation to the baths for his son the previous year.²⁰ Most notably, the most influential and wealthy *curiales* of Antioch displayed their pre-eminence by staging the Olympian Games of Antioch or the Syriarchy. In 332 the Olympian Games were undertaken by the elder Argyrius, Obodianus' father, and Phasganius, Libanius' uncle; in addition to staging the festival, they also doubled the seating in the Plethrum, as the location of the festivity was called, increasing the number of people who could enjoy the games, and boosting their standing in Antioch and beyond.²¹

A further practice of Constantius with which Julian found fault was the involvement of the emperor, his court and administration with the local residents, in particular its elites. In a crucial passage of his *Misopogon*, Julian lists the favours he and his friends did not bestow on Antioch during their stay there, contrasting his own sojourn in the Syrian capital to the situation under Constantius: none of them bought a field or a garden there or had a house built in the city, they had refrained from marrying the daughters of Antiocheans or marrying their own daughter to them, and none had enjoyed the beautiful young boys of the city. Further, they had not coveted the wealth of Assyria, nor had they been interested in becoming patrons of local corporations (by holding the *prostasia*). They had not allowed those in local office (i.e. the active local

¹⁹ Malosse (2001a) 92.

²⁰ Norman (1954) 45.

²¹ *Lib. Or.* 10. 9–11 with Norman (1954) 44.

curiales) to exercise influence over them.²² Finally, they had not encouraged the people to set up banquets and theatrical shows. They had not even paraded in the city with a grand entourage.²³ So if Constantius had allowed the Antiocheans, and in particular its elites, to share in the profits of empire, they had none of this under Julian (or so he implies). Perhaps unsurprisingly, Constantius enjoyed great popularity in Antioch (quite in contrast to Julian or Gallus); there was even talk of renaming the city Constantia after the emperor, so Julian later claimed.²⁴

Julian's account of the reciprocally profitable relationship between Constantius and his court and the people of Antioch is supported by literary and prosopographical evidence. As regards the economic benefits, a reference in Libanius' *Autobiography* offers valuable insights into interactions between the members of Constantius' court, or of embassies to the emperor, and the wealthy inhabitants of Antioch. In the early 380s Libanius remembered how during his stay in Nicomedia in the mid-340s his mother had sold his family property to a man 'now on his way to Italy'.²⁵ The buyer approached Libanius to confirm the sale with his signature, probably fearing that Libanius, who was the legal owner of the land, could otherwise reclaim it at a later stage. The fact that the buyer sought to have the sale certified before departing to Italy strongly suggests that Italy was the place of residence of Libanius' business partner, eager to secure this transaction before returning home. The anonymous buyer may have been a wealthy senator sojourning in Antioch either on an embassy

²² Jul. *Misop.* 365a–b.

²³ Jul. *Misop.* 342c, 350d. On such public appearances more generally: Lavan (2007) 162. On Constantius' engagement with the Antiochean people, see also Henck (2007); Malosse (2001a) 91–3.

²⁴ Jul. *Or.* 1.40d–41a; Downey (1963) 149. Henck (2001) 297 thoughtfully points out that the formula 'I often hear', ἀκούω πολλάκις, which Julian uses to introduce his point about the 'new name' of Antioch, 'Constantia' in Jul. *Or.* 1.40d '(at best) suggests that this *cognomen* existed but was not officially recognised' or that Julian invented it to denigrate Constantius.

²⁵ Lib. *Or.* 1.58. For the date of this oration, see Norman (1992a). For Libanius' curial and wealthy background and education, see e.g. Bradbury (2004) 2–6; Wintjes (2005) 43–76.

or in relation to an annual provincial office in the East; if so, he was not expecting to return to the East any time soon, hence the request.

Interestingly and in contrast to Julian, Libanius (a *curialis* from Antioch) is keen to stress the beneficent impact of the emperor on Antioch and in particular on its city council. He praises both Constantius and the praetorian prefects for treating the municipal council respectfully. He notes that the embassies of Antioch, led by their leading *curiales*, the *principales*, many of whom were Libanius' relatives, could 'converse with them before their thrones'.²⁶ These were privileged moments for petitioning the emperor; Libanius himself used several such ambassadors to promote his own agenda as well as that of his friends.²⁷ 'In such business', Libanius explains, 'the wisdom of the council was revealed to the emperor, and from him the councillors have received the honour of provincial appointments.'²⁸ This active engagement was often rewarded with an appointment in the imperial administration. For example Flavius Antonius Hierocles, a wealthy *curialis* from Tarsus, was appointed *consularis* of Syria in 348.²⁹

Prosopographical data confirms that the career prospects of Antioch's inhabitants and those of the surrounding region were greatly improved by the presence of the imperial court and administration stationed in Antioch; besides the extensive palatine administration and the staff of the praetorian prefect, Antioch was also the seat of the *comes Orientis* and probably also of the *consularis Syriae*. To the great annoyance of Libanius, opportunities for notaries abounded, some of whom went on to have stellar careers, including Flavius Florentius, praetorian prefect from 359 to 361, Palladius, *magister*

²⁶ Lib. *Or.* 11, 147 (trans. after Norman 2000).

²⁷ On these four major embassies to Constantius II, in 348, 355, 357 and 360, see Petit (1955) appendix 5, pp. 415–16.

²⁸ Lib. *Or.* 11.147 (trans. Norman 2000).

²⁹ *PLRE* I: 431 (Hierocles 3), see Chapter 3, pp. 104–6.

officiorum from 351 to 354, and Flavius Taurus, praeforian prefect from 355 to 361.³⁰ But the presence of the imperial administration also benefited the top echelons of Antioch's society, including men like Thalassius (praetorian prefect of Gallus from 351 to 353) or Publius Ampelius (*magister officiorum* in 335/358, proconsul of Achaëa from 359 to 360 and urban prefect of Rome in 371); both came from Antioch and will have begun their careers in the 340s.³¹ Nonetheless, while it is true that the continuous presence of Constantius' court in Antioch granted various career opportunities to local aristocrats in the lower administration, and the scope for participation in the imperial bureaucratic machinery was certainly impressive, as my earlier discussion of senatorial careers under Constantius in this period (Chapter 3) suggested, many of the most important posts remained the privilege of Roman senators.

There is another dimension to the important economic benefits that Antioch derived from Constantius' presence. During his stay in the Syrian capital, the army took a particularly prominent role, for Antioch functioned as the headquarters for preparing and planning the war against Shapur II and in particular as winter quarters for the emperor and his immediate military entourage. During the preparations for the campaigns against the Persians,

like rivers flowing into the sea, there flowed to our city (Antioch) legionaries, archers, cavalry, horses of war and burden, camels and engineers. The earth was covered with them as they sat and stood; the walls were hidden by the shields festooned upon them; spears and helmets could be seen everywhere; everywhere was the clash of arms, bustling men and whinnying horses. There were so many units encamped that their commanders alone would have made no small contingent. So great an army was concentrated

³⁰ Lib. *Or.* 42, 22–5; *PLRE* I: 365 (Florentius 10), 658 (Palladius 4), 879 (Taurus 3).

³¹ *PLRE* I: 886 (Thalassius 1): Thalassius served the emperor as *comes* in several secular and religious missions, see e.g. *Athan. Apol. Const.* 3; between 343 and 346, he was sent to Constans' camp in Poetovio. I discuss Thalassius' career further in Chapter 5, p. 182. *PLRE* I: 56 (Ampelius 3): Ampelius may have been *praeses Cappadocia*, but there is no evidence that he served as *notarius* as argued by Kuhoff (1983) 240, see Olszaniec (2013) Publius Ampelius.

Ruling the East (AD 337–350)

that if it had been billeted elsewhere, the drinking water, too, would have proved insufficient.³²

These men needed to be equipped and fed. The presence of such a huge army had the potential to drain local resources, but no shortages are known to have occurred under Constantius, perhaps as a result of improvements in the maritime supply logistics and the imperially driven transport of grain to Antioch.³³

However, these soldiers also had considerable spending power. Local businessmen and shopkeepers could profit from the demand of the imperial court, and from the imperial investments in the harbours in Seleucia and Laodicea. Hence, if Antioch owed her existence to her founder Antiochus, ‘her present wealth and increase in every sort of abundance she owes to you, since you provided her with harbours that offer good anchorage for those who put in there’. With these words Julian lauded Constantius in his first panegyric on his cousin.³⁴ As seat of Constantius’ court Antioch will also have received many embassies, foreign or from other parts of the empire, which sought to obtain an audience with the emperor or his high officials: these, too, needed accommodation, food and other amenities. As noted, the increased building activity also boosted demand for craftsmen and labourers. Finally, it is to be expected that money could also be made in providing entertainments: women and jugglers for the city, horses and wild animals for the circus.

Most significantly, Antioch became the platform for the celebration of Constantius’ imperial anniversaries, consulates and military victories, and the largess that went with it. As the numismatic record of Antioch suggests, this decade was an age of gold.³⁵ In 342 Constantius was able to celebrate his

³² *Lib. Or.* 11. 178 (trans. after Norman 2000). The presence of troops and military supplies are also mentioned in *Jul. Or.* 1. 20d, *Lib. Or.* 18. 166–9; 205–7 and *Or.* 69. 69–72, 89–92, see Henck (2002) 294 n. 126.

³³ On this, see Moser (2014).

³⁴ *Jul. Or.* 1.40d–41a (trans. Wright 1980).

³⁵ My discussion of the gold coinage of Constantius in Antioch has gained much from Wienand (2015), who offers an excellent discussion of the Antiochean medallions of Constantius II as well as high-quality colour photographs of the coins discussed.

third consulship and the second consulate of Constans; in 343 Constans celebrated his *decennalia*, Constantius his *vicennalia* since elevation to the Caesarship.³⁶ Constantius also distributed silver bowls, made in a workshop, probably an imperial *thesaurus*, in Antioch.³⁷ In 346 alone Antioch witnessed four major imperial occasions: the consular festivities of Constantius II (and Constans) opened with a consular *processus* in Antioch on 1 January 346; a grand celebration of Constantius' victory over Shapur II at Nisibis (or rather Shapur's unsuccessful siege of the city); Constantius' return to the city from his anniversary tour to Nicomedia and Constantinople (which is discussed below) in a festive *adventus* in the summer; and the conclusion of his anniversary festivities in the early autumn.³⁸

The mint output for all four occasions was impressive: for instance, a series of gold multiples consisting of 6.79g of pure gold, showing the two brother emperors as consuls, were minted for the *processus consularis* on 1 January.³⁹ Constans was also given a share in Constantius' great victory over Shapur II, which was celebrated with impressive gold medallions worth 9 solidi, consisting of 41.90g of pure gold. These medallions were of extremely high quality, both in intrinsic worth and in the craftsmanship of their motifs; on one, a heavily decorated emperor Constantius is shown on the obverse, while the reverse depicts both emperors, nimbate and with globes in their hands, in a chariot drawn by six horses; below them are shown an array of objects distributed during the *largitio* in Antioch – wreaths, money bags and a money basket.⁴⁰

Another medallion of the same weight and using the same obverse die was minted in Constantius' name alone: the reverse shows only Constantius in the chariot, called *D(ominus) N(oster) CONSTANTIVS VICTOR SEMPER AVG(ustus)*

³⁶ *RIC VIII* Antioch 20–9, perhaps also including nos. 30–1, which may, however, have belonged to the issue of 347/8. The *vota* indications are confusing, see Beyeler (2011) 130–2, and *RIC VIII* 502–3.

³⁷ Beyeler (2011) 130–2.

³⁸ Wienand (2015) 430.

³⁹ *RIC VIII* Antioch 7. For another example with a different obverse motif, see Baldus (1984) 83–5.

⁴⁰ *RIC VIII* Antioch 67 with Wienand (2015) 440–1, and Baldus (1984) 86–90.

in the legend.⁴¹ Then in late summer Antioch celebrated the return of Constantius from his tour to Constantinople in an *adventus*: a gold medallion worth 1½ solidi commemorated the *FELIX ADVENTVS AVG(usti) N(ostri)*, depicting the joyful moment when the diademed Constantius had travelled the richly decorated streets of Antioch on his horse, his imperial cloak floating behind him as he rode, and greeted the populace with raised hand.⁴² Shortly after this event the emperor concluded the twenty-fifth year since his elevation to the imperial throne with a special gold medallion (*VICTORIA AVGVSTORVM*).⁴³ Two years later in 348 Constantius then distributed smaller (silver) 9 siliquae pieces in order to mark Constantius' fifteenth imperial anniversary (as Caesar) from 25 December 347 to 25 December 348, and Constantius' twenty-fifth anniversary from 8 November 348 to 8 November 349.⁴⁴

All in all, then, Antioch became the platform for celebrating imperial anniversaries, consular processions and imperial victories with imperial largess. The truly impressive list of gold medallions, solidi and other gold coinage as well as silver coins testifies to the immense wealth spent in Antioch. Constantius was well aware of this fact, as a further medallion from Antioch underlines: on its obverse, it depicts a bust of Constantius in military dress, crowned with an elaborate diadem;⁴⁵ the reverse shows an emperor (Constantius II) in a chariot with an eagle-tipped sceptre in his left hand and, importantly, scattering coins from his right hand. Three specimens of this medallion are known today, all of which were minted with different dies, so the original output was not small.⁴⁶ This image was linked to a specific message: the coin-scattering emperor is introduced as

⁴¹ *RIC VIII* Antioch 68. Same obverse die: Wienand (2015) 442.

⁴² *RIC VIII* Antioch 76, dated to 346 by Bastien (1988) 86 n. 3, which is followed by Wienand (2015) 432 n. 33.

⁴³ *RIC VIII* Antioch 79.

⁴⁴ Nine siliqua piece: *RIC VIII* Antioch 97–8 with *RIC VIII* 504–5. Three other mints participated in the issue, but with a far smaller output: Constantinople: *RIC VIII* 60–1; Nicomedia: *RIC VIII* 40–4; Cyzicus: *RIC VIII* 43–4. On the term *siliqua*, see Abdy (2012) 594–5.

⁴⁵ *RIC VII* Antioch 78, with important corrections by Wienand (2015) 423–5, who offers a more detailed description of the coin.

⁴⁶ A point made by Wienand (2015) 425.

Remembering Constantine

the Glory of the Romans, *GLORIA ROMANORVM*.⁴⁷ As this section has revealed, many contemporaries will have agreed that under Constantius, the glory of Rome and the advantages of imperial presence that came with it were firmly rooted in Antioch.

Promoting Constantinople

After the death of Constantine in 337 Constantinople ceased to be an imperial residence. Imperial presence and the advantages that came with it were now rooted in Antioch. However, Constantius regularly visited Constantinople. He attended his father's funeral in 337 and, after a hasty visit in the winter of 341/342, he may have moved to Constantinople in 345 to celebrate the launch of his bathing complex, the *Thermae Constantianae*.⁴⁸ He returned in glamorous style in 346, and is also recorded in Constantinople in 349.⁴⁹ This suggests that Constantinople occupied an important position in Constantius' eastern empire, and that it was necessary for the emperor to travel there regularly. The following sections will investigate this relationship. The next two sections discuss Constantius' investments into the city and in particular his relationship with the city council in Constantinople. The next two sections then investigate Constantinople's role in Constantius' imperial ideology. Together, they show how Constantinople was transformed into an image of Constantius' imperial glory in this period.

I begin with Constantius' investments into the urban amenities of the city. Constantius transformed Constantinople into a major urban centre in the East. As one of his first political moves in Constantinople, around 340 Constantius upgraded the status of the province of Europa, which was henceforth

⁴⁷ *RIC VIII* Antioch 77.

⁴⁸ *Chron. Pasch.* a. 345, p. 34, lines 16–19. This possibility is noted in Destephen (2016) 358 and Seeck (1919) 192. Pfeilschifter (2013) 42 n. 3 and Barnes (1993) 220 are more sceptical.

⁴⁹ For the chronology of Constantius' returns to Constantinople, see also Pfeilschifter (2013) 358 and Destephen (2016) 47. I return to these visits below, on pp. 165–6.

governed by a proconsul. The first securely documented proconsul in Constantinople is Alexander in 341.⁵⁰ It has been suggested that his post was created following the redivision of the empire between Constans and Constantius in 340,⁵¹ but an earlier date is equally possible: the installation of a proconsul greatly improved administrative oversight over the region, which may have seemed useful after the disruptive events that followed Constantine's death in 337, when the city fell into the hands of Constantius. Whatever the date of its introduction, contemporary references to this position are rather vague, so it is not clear whether the title was proconsul of Europa or proconsul of Constantinople.⁵²

This reform greatly improved the status of the region in the administrative hierarchy of the empire. Its senatorial proconsul was, at least theoretically, on a par with the proconsul of Asia and, perhaps more importantly, ranked above the other provincial governors of the region, who, like the *praeses* of the province of Thrace in 337–41, Flavius Palladius, were still of equestrian rank.⁵³ Thus in 343 the proconsul at Constantinople, Donatus, exercised judicial authority over neighbouring provinces, for instance when he acted as judge in a matter concerning the neighbouring province of Rhodope. The province of Rhodope was probably not part of Donatus' own domain, which was restricted to the province of Europa, but he was probably called to judge this potentially problematic case – the exile of a bishop – because as proconsul his authority outranked the local equestrian provincial governor (*praeses*), as well as because he was an outsider and hence believed to be impartial.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ *PLRE I*: 40 (Alexander 3); *Lib. Or.* 1.45; *Athan. Apol. de fuga*, 3; *Him. Or.* 33 with Barnes (1987a).

⁵¹ Skinner (2008) 143.

⁵² Constantinople was known as the capital of the province of Europa: *Greg. Naz. Or.* 7.8 refers to Constantinople (called Byzantion!) as the city that is now the capital of Europa: ἡ νῦν προκαθεζομένη τῆς Εὐρώπης πόλις. *Contra*: Calvet-Sebasti (1995) 199 n. 2 who argues that Constantinople is described as the capital of the whole continent of Europe (as opposed to Asia).

⁵³ *PLRE I*: 661 (Fl. Palladius 17). This proconsulship was, however, the lowest ranking of the proconsulships in the empire: Malcus (1967) 151–2 and [Chapter 3](#), p. 100.

⁵⁴ *PLRE I*: 268 (Donatus 1); see also Dagron (1974) 218–20.

The proconsul of 342 was less successful. In late 342 following the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, Paul, a bishop exiled in 337, returned to Constantinople, prompting serious urban unrest. When the urban council failed to contain the matter – according to Libanius, who was living in Constantinople at the time – violent riots forced the proconsul Alexander to leave the city.⁵⁵ The situation seems to have been serious, prompting Constantius to send his *magister equitum* Hermogenes, but even the general was unable to suppress the riots, and the situation spiralled out of control when he was murdered by the crowd.⁵⁶ Eventually the emperor was forced to take the issue into his own hands.⁵⁷ Constantius hastened to Constantinople, restored order to the city, sent Paul back into exile, and installed a new proconsul, Ulpian Limenius.⁵⁸ As part of his punishment of the city, Constantius halved the corn dole that had been established for Constantinople under Constantine. The corn was brought into Constantinople by *navicularii*, who transported it from several corn-rich regions of the East, including the provinces of Asia, Thrace, the Bosphorus, Pontus and the Crimea, as well as Syria, Phoenicia and Egypt.⁵⁹ Rather than food for the poor, the bread doles of Roman times were to a restricted group of citizens and as such offered a patronage opportunity to the magistrates in the city responsible for its distribution. These magistrates were chosen from among the municipal council, so the reduction of the dole curtailed the influence of Constantinople's councillors, whom Constantius addressed in a speech that

⁵⁵ Lib. *Or.* 1.45 and *PLRE* I: 40 (Alexander 3). For a detailed chronology and discussion of the career of Paul of Constantinople, see Dagron (1974) 425–35. On Paul in Constantinople, see e.g. the brief summary of Pietri (1989) 173. Isele (2010) 33–50 offers a good discussion of the ecclesiastical disputes in Constantinople between 337 and 350.

⁵⁶ *PLRE* I: 422 (Hermogenes 1). Hermogenes may have been charged initially with the settlement of Gothic tribes on Roman land: Lib. *Or.* 59.89–93 with Thompson (1956) on Constantius' campaigns against the Goths.

⁵⁷ On Constantius' visit to Constantinople: Van Dam (2002) 73; Hunt (1998) 37.

⁵⁸ Hastening: Constantius was known for his ability to travel fast: Maraval (2013) 67 with refs. Paul: Soc. 2.12–13, Soz. 3.7. Limenius: *PLRE* I: 510 (Limenius 2), whom I discuss in detail in Chapter 3, pp. 99–100, 107–10.

⁵⁹ *CTh* 13.5.7 (334); on the origin of the corn for the dole, see also Them. *Or.* 17.336d, and Eunapius 462, ed. Wright, pp. 383–4 with Dagron (1974) 531–2.

seems to have rebuked them for failing to maintain civic order.⁶⁰ To some on the council, the cutback may also have represented a financial hit: many councillors may have owned fertile land in the regions where the corn for the dole was procured, and some may have acquired additional plots having profited from grants of land on imperial estates in Asia and Pontus as a result of their involvement in the building of homes in Constantinople.⁶¹ However, there were no further punishments and, according to Libanius, following the return of order and the arrival of Limenius, life in Constantinople went on as usual.⁶²

The incident did not halt imperial investments, which continued to pour into the city, including into the city's urban infrastructure. In this period, Constantius completed many of the buildings commenced by his father, including the city walls and the Hagia Eirene, Constantinople's first episcopal church.⁶³ Constantius pursued construction of a large bathing complex, the *Thermae Constantianae* in 345, inaugurated only in 427 and thereafter called the Theodosian baths. As these building works were probably begun under Constantine, they were not part of Constantius' plan for the city but that of his father, which he claimed for himself.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Speech: Lib. *Or.* 59.97; bread dole and patronage: Skinner (2015) 235. The key role of municipal councils in urban riots is better known from Antioch, where in 303 Diocletian called the city council to account for failing to prevent unrest; in 362 Julian waited in vain for the βουλή to deal with the famine that plagued Antioch that year before sending imperial officials to attend to the problem: Liebeschuetz (1972) 103; Julian: Amm. 22.14; Jul. *Misop.* 369c–d; Lib. *Or.* 18.195. Earlier in 354 the Caesar Gallus took drastic measures in his punishment of the Antiochean elites for their ineffectiveness in the food crisis – Ammianus reports that Gallus ordered all town councillors to be put to death: Amm. 14.7.1–3 with Matthews (1989) 406–9.

⁶¹ *Theod. Nov.* 5.1.

⁶² Lib. *Or.* 1. 45–7.

⁶³ Isele (2010) 33–50 discusses the role of this church in the ecclesiastical politics in Constantinople in this decade.

⁶⁴ Constantius' building works in Constantinople: Harries (2012) 200; Henck (2001); Dagron (1974) 89–90; Mango (1985) 37–8; in 357 Themistius praised the future beauty of the still unfinished baths, Them. *Or.* 4. 58b–c with Mango (1985) 40–1; Dagron (1974) 89. City wall and completion of other buildings: Jul. *Or.* 1.41a.

Remembering Constantine

Perhaps more importantly, Constantius also invested in the academic facilities of the city.⁶⁵ Evidence for the educational amenities of Constantinople comes in the first instance from Libanius, who spent several years as teacher of rhetoric in the city. Constantinople did not treat the young Libanius well, so the orator later claims in his *Autobiography*.⁶⁶ His negative stance towards the city and the events of his time there must therefore be taken with a pinch of salt, but his account nonetheless offers helpful insights into the provision of education within the city, and Constantius' role in it.⁶⁷ The traditional Greek education was a central part of the *esprit de corps* of the leading circles of the empire.⁶⁸ Mastery of it was a key criterion for a successful career in the imperial or ecclesiastical administration.⁶⁹ Most cities therefore did not depend on its provision by private teaching alone, but funded a municipal chair. Teachers were appointed by the city council, and received their income from municipal funds.⁷⁰ In addition, wealthy curial elites provided financial support for teachers in their hometown, in order to further their political prestige.⁷¹ Governors, too, took a personal interest in the quality of the teaching provided in the cities under their authority. The governor of Ancyra from 362 to 364, Maximus, a native of Antioch, provided a supplement to the salary of the municipal teachers from his private funds, employed additional teachers, organized more rhetorical contests and increased the prize money.⁷² In 352/3 the proconsul of the province of Achaëa,

⁶⁵ On the promotion of the liberal arts in Constantinople under Constantius, see also Henck (2001).

⁶⁶ Written before AD 380, but with later additions: Norman (1992a) 7–16.

⁶⁷ On the rhetorical nature of Libanius' *Autobiography*: Van Hoof (2011). Family and education of Libanius: Bradbury (2004) 2–6; Wintjes (2005) 43–76.

⁶⁸ The ground-breaking work is Brown (1971), see also Crihiore (2007) 84–8; Liebeschuetz (2001) 223–4. On the organization of education in late antiquity: Crihiore (2009), (2007); Kaster (1988).

⁶⁹ E.g. Sandwell (2009), (2007); Penella (2007); Métivier (2005); Bradbury (2004); Wintjes (2005); Van Dam (2003a), (2003b), (2002); Heather and Moncur (2001); Barnes (1987a).

⁷⁰ On their privileges, see *CTh* 13.3.1 (321); *Lib. Or.* 31.19–21 with Jones (1964) 2: 736.

⁷¹ *Lib. Ep.* 552.

⁷² *PLRE* I: 583 (Maximus 19) with *Lib. Ep.* 1230, see Mitchell (1993b) 89–90; Kaster (1988) 217–19. Maximus later became prefect of Egypt.

Strategius Musonianus, wooed the city council of Athens by suggesting the appointment of Libanius to one of their official chairs.⁷³ A year later in Antioch, if Libanius' account is to be trusted, Musonianus, by then praetorian prefect of the East, was involved in the establishment of famous teachers in Antioch.⁷⁴

In this connection Constantinople appears to have profited from special imperial arrangements. The evidence suggests that here the provision of good teaching was considered a matter of imperial concern. In Constantinople public teachers were appointed by the emperor (on the recommendation of the city council or a high official), and paid from imperial funds.⁷⁵ In 341 a Cappadocian had been elected to a chair by Constantius at the request of the city council, much to the disappointment of Libanius, who had hoped to secure this post himself.⁷⁶ This Cappadocian received a salary from the imperial treasury, paid to him by the praetorian prefect of the East.⁷⁷ By 348 it was Libanius himself who, through the involvement of the praetorian prefect Philippus, was appointed to this position, which he held until 354.⁷⁸ As a result, when Libanius wanted to establish himself permanently in Antioch in 354, he had to petition the Caesar Gallus repeatedly to be allowed to leave Constantinople: evidently, this was no municipal decision.⁷⁹ His emoluments seem to have been generous, including legal and fiscal privileges and the revenue of landed property, as well as other privileges fixed by the proconsuls and the municipal council.⁸⁰ When he finally moved to Antioch in the mid-350s

⁷³ *PLRE* I: 611 (Strategius Musonianus); *Lib. Or.* 1.18, 82 with Kaster (1988) 222–3.

On the date, see Barnes (1989b) 417, who prefers 352.

⁷⁴ Kaster (1983) esp. 43; Wintjes (2005) 110, 135–43.

⁷⁵ Kaster (1988) 218 n. 80; (1983), esp. 39–44. For the appointment process, see also Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 93.

⁷⁶ *Lib. Or.* 1.35, see Jones (1964) 2: 707.

⁷⁷ *Lib. Or.* 1.37.

⁷⁸ Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 96.

⁷⁹ *Lib. Or.* 74–80, 88 (petition to Gallus), 93–5 (letter of authorization from Constantius). On Libanius' career from 348 to 354: Bradbury (2004) 6–7; Wintjes (2005) 89–97.

⁸⁰ *Lib. Or.* 1.80; the nature of Libanius' salary and its composition is disputed: Criboire (2007) 90 and Kaster (1983) with further refs.

Libanius was gradually divested of these privileges, and eventually of his Constantinopolitan salary, against his will: the privileges must have been linked to the post in Constantinople, not to Libanius in person.⁸¹ Some of these emoluments, including generous grain and oil allowances of about thirty times the normal *annona* rations, could be used to attract additional students, a crime to which Themistius, himself a public professor in Constantinople from the early 350s onwards, had to plead guilty, though he denied that he had sold the rations for cash or accepted additional emoluments.⁸²

Elsewhere emperors interfered only rarely in the appointment of teachers, with the exception of *ad hoc* or *ad hominem* grants given alongside immunities from fiscal obligations.⁸³ The level of imperial involvement in teaching facilities in Constantinople is thus unusual in the municipal context. Those of Constantinople do, however, bear a strong resemblance to the imperial chairs in Greek and Latin at Rome and those in philosophy and rhetoric at Athens; here too, salaries were paid out of imperial funds.⁸⁴ It is not known when Constantinople's imperially funded chair was introduced, but Libanius' description of the city's educational institutions in his *Autobiography* suggests that 337/40 is a likely date. In 340 the chair was occupied by the Cappadocian rhetor Bemarchius, who was followed by another teacher from Cappadocia, Libanius' rival in 341.⁸⁵ However, not all teachers in Constantinople could profit from such support. Teachers like Evanthius, a Latin grammarian from Africa, and Didymus, a (Greek?) grammarian from Egypt,⁸⁶ the Spartan grammarian Nicocles or the sophist

⁸¹ On this, see Kaster (1983) 41–9.

⁸² Public professorship: Heather and Moncur (2001) 43 esp. n. 2. Defence: Them. *Or.* 23.292b–c, see Heather and Moncur (2001) 105–6; Penella (2000) 19, 120 n. 21. Themistius could afford not to demand fees from his students: Them. *Or.* 23.288c–d, see Heather and Moncur (2001) 107.

⁸³ Kaster (1988) 216–30 offers a comprehensive analysis of the role of the emperor in higher education. Personal grants: Kaster (1988) 219–20, 222–7.

⁸⁴ Kaster (1988) 217–18, 227; Jones (1964) 2: 707–8. Schlange-Schöningh (1995) who identifies municipal (*städtisch*) chairs in Constantinople, esp. pp. 91–101, while still arguing for an unusual degree of imperial involvement on pp. 5–7.

⁸⁵ *PLRE* I: 160 (Bemarchius). Official rhetor: Schlange-Schöningh (1995) 93.

⁸⁶ See (Kaster) 1988 part II nos. 44, 54.

Hecebolius depended on their own sources of income, as Libanius had done at first.⁸⁷ This was true also of Themistius, who in 347 returned from Nicomedia to continue his career in Constantinople.⁸⁸ Nonetheless demand for teaching seems to have soared thanks to Constantius' investments in the imperial chair and, perhaps, teaching facilities and equipment, attracting also Himerius, born in Prusa in Bithynia around 320 but educated at Athens, to teach in Constantinople until 352, when he returned to Attica.⁸⁹

Libanius' evidence reveals that, in this period, Constantinople established itself as a supra-urban centre of learning. Once installed as a private teacher, Libanius (so he later boasted) was swiftly able to recruit a great number of students not only from among those already in Constantinople – that is, the students of other teachers – but also from elsewhere.⁹⁰ The student body was thus composed of the sons of wealthy Constantinopolitans and of wealthy *curiales* from the region. While Athens was notorious for student riots, no such violent behaviour is recorded for Constantinople's students.⁹¹ What is more, there was great appetite for intellectual *symposia* among the wealthy and powerful of Constantinople. The evidence for such learned drinking parties has been gathered by Heinrich Schlange-Schöningh.⁹² As he noted, Libanius

⁸⁷ Lib. *Ep.* 1368; Kaster (1988) 203. On Nicocles, see Bradbury (2004) 259; Kaster (1988) 317–21 no. 106 helpfully discusses the relationship between the grammarian Nicocles and the teachers of rhetoric who provided 'higher education'. Self-employed teacher in Constantinople in the early 340s: Wintjes (2005) 77–89; Kaster (1983) 38. *Contra*: Schlange-Schöningh (1995) 92–3, who holds that Libanius was a public teacher in Constantinople in 340.

⁸⁸ *PLRE* I: 291 (Eugenius 2) with Heather and Moncur (2001) 1; Them. *Or.* 24 which inaugurated Themistius' Nicomedian lecture cycle sometime before 344. It is possible that Themistius had left Constantinople while still a student: Heather and Moncur (2001) 1; Vanderspoel (1995) 31–42.

⁸⁹ Teaching facilities in Constantinople: see the discussion of Schlange-Schöningh (1995) 101–7. Heather and Moncur (2001) 101–2 illuminate the evidence from Themistius on the matter. On the life and work of Himerius, see Völker (2003) and Barnes (1987a).

⁹⁰ Lib. *Or.* 1.37.

⁹¹ On how to be a good student, see Gregory of Nazianzus' description of his late brother's exemplary behaviour as a student in Athens: Greg. Naz. *Or.* 7.6–8.

⁹² Schlange-Schöningh (1995) 111–14.

Remembering Constantine

later claimed that he despised these evenings when he had to go drinking with the influential of the city as a public teacher in Constantinople in the late 340s.⁹³ His rival Bemarchius is criticized for strengthening his support in the city at such social events.⁹⁴ A more philosophical gathering is mentioned in a letter from 355, from Libanius to Themistocles, who was probably a philosopher based in Constantinople and who, to judge from the letter, often organized such *symposia*, at which Themistius was a regular guest.⁹⁵ As the letter reveals, in 355 Libanius' friend and student Olympius, a doctor from Antioch en route to the court of Constantius, which by that time had moved to Italy, was invited to join these meetings, which was evidently an honour.⁹⁶

Provision of a high level of teaching was also assisted by the upgrading of Constantinople's governors to the rank of proconsul. As provincial governors, the proconsuls were closely involved in provision of teaching in their municipalities.⁹⁷ We know from Themistius that the proconsuls of Constantinople attended public speeches in the city, and a panegyric from Himerius reveals that they were keen to be praised for their efforts in this respect.⁹⁸ Often they were called to judge rival

⁹³ Lib. *Or.* 1.75. It is possible that Libanius is referring to a similar meeting at Lib. *Or.* 1.39, where he described his reception by the men of learning in Constantinople during his first visit to the city.

⁹⁴ Lib. *Or.* 1.39.

⁹⁵ Lib. *Ep.* 406 with Fatouros and Krischer (1980) 68 no. 28 with notes on pp. 323–5. On Themistocles, see *PLRE I*: 894 (Themistocles).

⁹⁶ *PLRE I*: 644 (Olympius 4)

⁹⁷ Kaster (1988) 216–30.

⁹⁸ Proconsul: Them. *Or.* 22.266c; 25.310b; 28.343a with Heather and Moncur (2001) 102. The passages are discussed by Penella (2000) at 17–18, 25–6 and 30–1 respectively. As Penella points out, the term 'archon' used by Themistius here is commonly employed for governors, but it remains possible that it refers to an emperor, as has been argued by some. In view of our knowledge of public competitions taking place in front of governors and proconsuls (e.g. Libanius and Bemarchius in front of the proconsul of Constantinople in 340, Libanius in front of Philagrius in 348, see Lib. *Or.* 1.42–3 and 70–2 respectively, and the public contest organized by the praetorian prefect Anatolius in the mid-340s, see Eun. *Vit.* 10.6), as well as the rarity of imperial sojourns in Constantinople, I suggest that it is far more likely that 'archon' refers to the proconsul of Constantinople than to the emperor. Panegyric by Himerius: Him. *Or.* 62.

teachers. When in 341 Libanius' aggressive recruitment policy provoked strong opposition from his fellow teachers, they challenged him in public contests (perhaps similar in kind to those later held by Themistius), sought to have him expelled from the city and brought their case to the proconsul in Constantinople Alexander, accusing Libanius of magic.⁹⁹ Following Alexander's swift replacement by Limenius after the riots of 342, it was then up to the new proconsul to deal with the accusations, which he took very seriously – or so Libanius' fanciful and grossly distorted account suggests.¹⁰⁰ After his appointment to an official chair in Constantinople in 348, the subsequent proconsuls were more to Libanius' liking, as they granted him further privileges in addition to the regular benefits of his public chair. However, when in 355 Libanius transferred his residence permanently to Antioch, the proconsul Justinus stripped him of his Constantinopolitan salary by imperial order and claimed damages for Libanius' failure to teach in Constantinople in the previous years.¹⁰¹ With proconsular rank, Justinus had the necessary authority to defend Constantinople's interests in the matter.

Thanks to these provisions, Constantinople soon emerged as an educational centre in the East. As contemporary observers such as Gregory of Nazianzus noted, it managed to establish itself as a centre of philosophy in only a decade, which was no small achievement.¹⁰² Even the Athenian rhetor Himerius had to concede that Constantinople had become an important seat of learning.¹⁰³ In this context it is noteworthy that Constantinople's chair was not in Latin or Roman (i.e. Latin) law: Bemarchius, Libanius, and later Themistius taught Greek rhetoric or philosophy. Constantinople was therefore not to become only a new centre of Latin in the East; thanks to imperial investments as well as private or local initiatives, it

⁹⁹ The defence speeches by Themistius are conveniently discussed in Heather and Moncur (2001) 101–7 and Penella (2000) esp. 18–22, 28–31, 34–40.

¹⁰⁰ Lib. *Or.* 1.42–8.

¹⁰¹ Kaster (1983) 43.

¹⁰² Greg. Naz. *Or.* 43.14; Them. *Or.* 20, 294b.

¹⁰³ Him. *Or.* 7.13.

emerged as a centre for traditional learning more generally.¹⁰⁴ In sum, Constantius invested greatly in the urban infrastructure, administration and teaching facilities of Constantinople in this decade. Under him the city was equipped with the amenities and administrative establishment needed to guarantee that the greatly enlarged city would survive without Constantine and his court, and became an attractive place in which to live and to learn. Most importantly, through his involvement in the provision of teaching in Constantinople, Constantius provided himself with a platform to display his care for the city. Several panegyrics on Constantius' commitment to Constantinople suggest that his investments in the provision of education were presented as a reflection of his imperial qualities.¹⁰⁵ In particular the appointment of good teachers was a key criterion, given that the renown of a city depended also on the quality of its sophists.¹⁰⁶ This helps to explain the involvement of the praetorian prefect Philippus in the appointment of Libanius to the official chair at Constantinople in 348: this could be seen as a token of imperial favour towards Constantinople, and a matter that merited the attention of Constantius' highest administrator.

Praetorships in Constantinople

The previous section suggested that Constantius undertook extensive investments in Constantinople. In this section I re-examine the evidence for a senate in Constantinople, which is often supposed to have been part of this imperially driven development scheme. In a ruling that came into effect on 9

¹⁰⁴ On the literary culture of Constantinople: Van Hoof (2010), (2011); Heather and Moncur (2001); Dagron (1968).

¹⁰⁵ E.g. Them. *Or.* 2 and 4 and Him. *Or.* 62. When Julian attended public lectures in Constantinople in the late 330s and early 340s (discussed in Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 49–53 with refs.), he may have acted as a representative of Constantius II, displaying imperial approval of the quality of the teaching. *Contra*: Schlage-Schöningen (1995) 52. On the close relationship between 'Stadtlob' and 'Herrscherlob', see Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 5–7, 17–18, 35–8. While interconnected, this is not to be confounded with debates about Constantius' own *paideia* more generally, esp. in historiography (e.g. Ammianus), some of which are summarized in e.g. Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 15–18.

¹⁰⁶ Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 96.

September 340, Constantius ordered that there be three annual praetors in Constantinople, who had to finance and organize games in the city, and he defined the financial duties of the praetors by prescribing the amount to be spent on their game-giving duties (*CTh* 6.4.5, 6).

This ruling is the earliest secure source for games termed ‘praetorian’ in Constantinople, and is hence often taken as evidence that it was Constantius who introduced these games to the city.¹⁰⁷ Other scholars have pointed out that Constantius could have merely elaborated a prior, Constantinian regulation concerning praetorships in Constantinople. This view rests largely on the arguments advanced by André Chastagnol;¹⁰⁸ however, as I showed in [Chapter 2](#), the two Constantinian laws cited by Chastagnol in support of his argument do not establish the existence of praetorships in Constantinople under Constantine. Consequently *CTh* 6.4.5 and 6 are the earliest secure references to games of this name in Constantinople.

These offices had important fiscal ramifications: they were taxes on the income of the wealthy members of the Constantinopolitan citizenry, to be invested in the entertainment venues of their city. It is generally argued that the praetorships in Constantinople mentioned in these laws were offices attached to a second senate in Constantinople similar to the one in Rome, where it was a tradition that young senators joined the senate by holding praetorships.¹⁰⁹ It has already been argued above ([Chapter 2](#)) that there was no such senate under Constantine. Here it will be shown that, in the 340s too, the available evidence suggests rather that these offices and the council in Constantinople to which they were attached were something smaller in scale, namely a municipal council.

I begin with a detailed discussion of the preserved ruling. The first praetorship mentioned in *CTh* 6.4.5 and 6 was called the ‘Flavian’ praetorship, probably in honour of the ruling dynasty. It was the most expensive one. A Flavian praetor had to spend

¹⁰⁷ Dagron (1974) 125, 150 n. 7; Jones (1964) 2: 537–41, 688, esp. 537: ‘In Constantinople praetorian games were instituted by Constantius; no others are recorded’.

¹⁰⁸ Chastagnol (1992) 251–2; (1976) 346–7.

¹⁰⁹ E.g. Heather (1998) 185.

25,000 folles and 50 pounds of silver (the latter equals c. 257 solidi) on the games and their organization.¹¹⁰ The second praetor, called ‘Constantinian’, had to pay 20,000 folles and 40 pounds of silver (c. 205 solidi). The third praetor, the ‘Triumphal’, had to contribute 15,000 folles and 30 pounds of silver (c. 154 solidi), but was exempted from the organization of games.

In the Theodosian Code the word *praetura* is used only in relation to the imperial senate of Rome or, in the 350s, that of Constantinople. However, these praetorships are conspicuously cheap. In 361, when the Constantinopolitan senate had become a full equal of Rome and its membership was drawn from the wealthiest echelons of the provincial elite, the (minimum) costs of the praetorship had to be multiplied by a factor of twenty to arrive at sums suitable for a senate: in 361 a new law required the Constantinian praetor to pay 1,000 pounds of silver (c. 5,142 solidi), the third 500 pounds of silver (c. 2,571 solidi), twenty times the amounts of 340.¹¹¹ In 340 the ‘praetorian’ games must therefore have been of limited scale, affordable by the more modest means of the urban elite of Constantinople.¹¹² Rather than being on a par with Rome, the Constantinopolitan praetorships were probably similar in price range to the curial liturgies performed by municipal councillors such as the ones Libanius describes in Antioch, where young councillors were, for instance, responsible for providing horse races.¹¹³ The modest expenditures laid down

¹¹⁰ For the conversion rates into solidi, see Hendy (1989) 465–6: silver to gold ratio: 14/1, so 1 lb silver = 1/14 lb gold = 5.14 solidi.

¹¹¹ *CTh* 6.4.13 (361).

¹¹² Note also that a single house in Antioch could generate an annual revenue of 240 solidi (*Lib. Pont.* 34.19), and that senators in Constantinople in the late 350s possessed large portfolios of landed property consisting of multiple properties with similar revenues each, on which see Moser (2016b) 734–7.

¹¹³ Municipal games in Antioch, see Liebeschuetz (1972) 144–9; Jones (1964) 2: 734–77 with 3: 234 nn. 56–8, and 2: 1017 with 3: 336–7 n. 67; *Lib. Or.* 11.113–19 offers an idealistic description of the duties of *curiales* to their city. Young councillors traditionally undertook the chariot liturgy; some took the trouble to buy horses from as far afield as Spain: Casella (2007) 107–11; Liebeschuetz (1972) 147–8. One *curialis*, Julianus of Antioch, is said to have ruined himself through the liturgy: *Lib. Or.* 54.22, 45. Jones (1964) 3: 756 n. 100, however, rightly notes that while these liturgies were a temporary financial ‘embarrassment’ for their holders whose capital was mostly landed as larger sums were not easily raised except by the sale of land, these losses were compensated through later income.

in the laws from 340 would suggest that it was a council of a size similar to that of Athens (300 members), about half the size of the *boule* of Antioch.¹¹⁴ This is not contradicted by the fact that the law discusses the problem of absenteeism by the praetors, a problem that is known from Rome (as discussed in [Chapter 1](#)). Similar issues are discussed in Constantius' legislation issued the previous year, revealing that municipal officials, too, were often absenting themselves to avoid their municipal duties.¹¹⁵

However, rather than size, an important question for discerning the character of the assembly at Constantinople is whether recruitment was possible from outside the city, which was the rule for the imperial senate in Rome but very rare among urban councils. In 2008 Alexander Skinner argued that the members of the council in Constantinople were drawn from the provinces, concluding that it started to function as a senate in the early 340s. His argument rests on evidence from Libanius. The first is a passage in Libanius' *Autobiography*, and the second from a later speech in defence of an unsuccessful applicant to the senate (as discussed already in [Chapter 2](#)); in both cases Libanius criticizes the quality of the membership of the council. In the passage from his *Autobiography* Libanius explains that, when he delivered declamations in Constantinople in the late 340s, many of the members of the council were unable to appreciate their quality because they

¹¹⁴ Athens: *IG* II–III² 4222 + 3716; Antioch: *Lib. Or.* 2.33, 48.3, 49.8; on the size of municipal councils and the senate in Constantinople, see also Laniado (2002) 5–7; Jones (1964) 2: 724. In [Chapter 6](#), p. 221, I return to the size of the senate in 355 as implied in *Them. Or.* 34.13.

¹¹⁵ *CTh* 12.1.23: On 11 October 338, Constantius sent a letter to a provincial governor by the name of Julianus who had inquired about how to ensure attendance in local *curiae*. The emperor informs him that while there is already a law that punishes *curiales* who fail to present themselves after three summonses, the emperor allowed a more lenient course of action: Julianus was to send the culprits a warning of the impending fine in a fourth edict, to which they had to respond, either in person or by a defender, and offer a legitimate excuse for their absence within 30 days. The original punishment was to be inflicted only upon failure to respond. Municipal absenteeism was also rife in the West: emperors were repeatedly forced to fight against curial desertion due to the grant of fictive or other titles, see *CTh* 12.1.26, 24, 6.22.2, 12.1.17, 47, 29.

were drawn from the army rather than the schools.¹¹⁶ Skinner attractively proposes that when referring to ἐξ ὀπλων Libanius is in fact referring to the imperial administration, which also described itself as a *militia*.¹¹⁷ However, it is unnecessary to conclude that he is referring to senatorial officials and I suggest that, based on the evidence examined in [Chapter 2](#), where I discussed Constantine's reform and expansion of the equestrian administration in the East, it is equally possible that Libanius' audience was composed of councillors who had served in equestrian offices that granted them certain immunities and social distinction within the council. Indeed, rather than faulting their careers in the imperial administration, Libanius may have been faulting their education, suggesting that many had been trained in short-hand skills rather through an extended classical education.

The other argument adduced by Skinner is based on a later speech of Libanius, discussed already, where he criticizes the quality of certain senators in Constantinople, including Flavius Philippus and Flavius Taurus.¹¹⁸ Skinner notes that these men acquired senatorial rank in the 340s, and infers from this that they became members in Constantinople in this period.¹¹⁹ However, as has been discussed in [Chapters 2](#) and [3](#), until 350 many senators in service in the East were clearly attached to the senate in Rome, and there is no need to assume that the new senators were attached to a senate in the East instead. The two passages from Libanius are hence not evidence for outside recruitment in Constantinople in the 340s and so cannot be used to argue for the existence of a senate there in this period. Indeed, nowhere does Libanius imply that the municipal council in Constantinople was different in nature from those of other cities in the East. In view of this, it may be best to conclude that in this period, too, the assembly

¹¹⁶ Lib. *Or.* 1.76: τὸ μὲν οὖν δεικνύναι λόγους οὐδὲ ὡς κατέλυσα, καὶ συνήεσαν οἱ μὲν ἀκουσόμενοι λόγων, οἱ πλείους δὲ θεασόμενοι κινούμενον, οἷα δὴ τὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἐκείνης ἐξ ὀπλων ἢ μουσείων τὸ πλεόν.

¹¹⁷ Skinner (2008) 135–6.

¹¹⁸ Lib. *Or.* 42.23–4.

¹¹⁹ Skinner (2008) 133–6.

to which these praetors were attached was still a municipal council rather than a senate.

The question remains: why did Constantius invest in this council in Constantinople in spite of his own absence from the city? It seems likely that, as with his investments in higher education, the council was used to display Constantius' imperial qualities. This is revealed by the titles of the praetorships and the date of the ruling. I begin with the titles. As outlined in *CTh* 6.4.5 the titles of the three praetors indicate that the praetorships were set up to celebrate, in this order, the Flavian dynasty, its founder Constantine and the triumphant nature of its rule. The reorganized praetorships of Constantius, then, were centred on the new emperor and his dynasty: the Flavian praetor ranked above the Constantinian praetor, its success underlined by the Triumphal praetor. Next, close analysis of the dating suggests that these praetorships were connected to the imperial anniversary: the subscription suggests that the law was issued on 9 September 340, but the consular date reveals that it was issued six months before that, in March 340.¹²⁰ I propose that the delay was deliberate: The law was issued early in the year in Antioch, when the festivities for the third imperial anniversary, on 9 September 340, were being prepared. It was sent to Constantinople in advance to be read out at the imperially themed games on 9 September in Constantinople, to coincide with the imperial anniversary. The earlier date was then wrongly recorded as the official reading of the law in Constantinople. The praetorships mentioned in 340 would thus have been put in place to celebrate the reign of Constantius and his brothers. This also

¹²⁰ The law has a post-consular date: it is given *post consulatum domini nostri Constantii II et Constantis*. However, they were consuls in 339, not 340. Post-consular dates were used at the beginning of each year when the names of the new consuls had not yet been transmitted to the respective administrative authority, but the latest recorded use of the post-consular dating in 340 is March 340, see Bagnall (1987) 215. This is a *terminus ante quem* for *CTh* 6.4.5,6, which must therefore have been issued at least six months before the date indicated by the subscription. Cuneo (1997) 57 even suggests that the law may have been issued in 339. I am grateful to Simon Corcoran and Benet Salway for alerting me to this problem.

explains why the emperor was prepared to advance the funds for his new Constantinopolitan games in the likelihood of the game-givers' absence: this would ensure that the games were staged at all events.¹²¹ It is not known whether Constantius presided over these games: a law dated to 12 August 340 and issued in Edessa suggests that Constantius was still in the East at that point, so he is unlikely to have been in Constantinople on 9 September 340. Nonetheless, by being held annually in Constantinople, the embodiment of his Constantinian descent, the festive staging of this games proclaimed Constantius' legitimacy in the city that had witnessed his brutal rise to sole rule in the East (which is discussed below).

Taken together, the so-called praetorships of Constantinople recorded in imperial legislation from 340 were funds, and in some cases games, provided by members of the municipal council of Constantinople. Their introduction was an ambitious move by Constantius II: as the timing of their introduction as well as their titles and financing imply, he sought to use these games to enhance his public image as emperor. They also underlined his strong link to the city that stood like no other for the Constantinian heritage. That said, such 'imperial games' were perhaps not unique to Constantinople: all major cities of the empire, including Antioch but also the small town of Oenoanda, celebrated games in honour of Constantius and the imperial family.¹²² Nonetheless, chariot races and theatrical performances were in high favour among Constantinople's residents if Libanius is to be believed, and Constantius' new regulations on the games were probably particularly well-received in this city.¹²³

¹²¹ *CTh* 6.4.6.

¹²² Imperial cult in the provinces: Salzman (1990) 137. For games attached to the imperial cult under Constantius in Oenoanda, see Millner (2015). It is possible that in Rome there existed a Constantinian *praetor*, introduced in the 320s by Constantine: this is a possible reading of *CTh* 3.32.2, *CJ* 5.71.18, and *CJ* 7.62.17, on which see Chapter 2.

¹²³ *Lib. Or.* 1.37.

Rewriting Imperial Funerals

The discussion thus far has revealed that despite his absence, Constantius invested heavily in Constantinople. While there is no evidence for the creation of a second senate in Constantinople, the evidence does suggest that the city and its council occupied a special role in Constantius' empire. Constantius had been raised to the position of Caesar in Constantinople, so it is perhaps not unexpected that his relationship to it should take a special form. But there is more: the next two sections will show that the memory of Constantine played a key role in Constantius' imperial ideology and that as part of this policy Constantinople was used as an instrument of Constantius' self-aggrandizement. However, before examining this use of Constantinople in more detail, it is first necessary to delineate Constantius' policies to exploit the memory of Constantine in support of his own position. This section looks at the period between 337 and 340. The following one will consider the period of joint rule with Constans from 340 to 350. It will then be possible to locate Constantius' efforts on behalf of Constantinople more securely in the context of his imperial policies at the time.

Constantius' appeals to the memory of Constantine in the aftermath of his rise to the rank of Augustus were manifold. In late 337, the mints of Constantinople produced a *solidus* depicting a motif that has received much attention from both contemporaries and modern scholars: on their obverse they show a veiled emperor, identified by the legend as Constantine (Figure 4.2a); on the reverse, they depict a veiled emperor standing in a quadriga which is ascending into heaven, whence a divine hand reaches down to the driver (Figure 4.2b).¹²⁴

Significantly, Constantine is titled *Pater Augustorum*, Father of the Emperors, on this *solidus*: *DIVVS CONSTANTINVS AVG(ustus) PATER AVGG(ustorum)*. Kent proposes that the coin was minted for the occasion of the funeral of

¹²⁴ *RIC* VIII Constantinople 1. The series was accompanied by *vota* coinage for the three new emperors: *RIC* VIII Constantinople 2–9.

Remembering Constantine



FIGURE 4.2 Solidus, (a) obverse depicting a veiled bust of Constantine I with the legend *DIVVS CONSTANTINVS AVG(ustus) PATER AVGG(ustorum)*, (b) reverse showing a toga-clad figure in a four-horsed chariot driving towards the sky, from where a divine hand reaches down to the driver. 1986,0610.1.

© The Trustees of the British Museum.

Constantine.¹²⁵ While this is possible, the obverse legend, calling Constantine father of the emperors, *pater Augustorum*, suggests otherwise. His sons were only made *Augusti* by the Senate of Rome on 9 September 337; more importantly, they only officially acted as such following this official proclamation. It is thus unlikely that the coin was minted before this event in autumn 337.¹²⁶ The solidi should therefore be seen as part of a move to rewrite the history of Constantine's succession by Constantius after his acclamation by the senate: with this image, Constantius (under whose nose the murder of his dynastic rivals had taken place, as will be discussed below) sought to claim legitimacy through reference to the notion of *consecratio*, which suggested an uncontested transmission of power to the new emperors.¹²⁷ The coin established a suitable version of the succession of Constantine and bolstered the claim of imperial continuity: when the deceased Constantine

¹²⁵ Kent (1981) 441.

¹²⁶ Grünewald (1990) 161; Pietri (1989) 125.

¹²⁷ MacCormack (1981) 122; on the *consecratio*, see also Price (2008) 98–102 and Grünewald (1990) 159–62.

had gone to the gods at the moment of his consecration, he was already the father of the emperors.¹²⁸ This motif insinuated that the three new emperors had already been emperors at the time of Constantine's funeral, and that the funeral had been a moment of unbroken continuity.

In order to grasp the meaning of the quadriga motif fully, it is necessary first to recapitulate the events that followed the death of Constantine. It is unclear whether Constantine had established a successor prior to his death on 22 May 337, but his succession was disputed among his possible successors.¹²⁹ One of the most important confrontations took place in Constantinople, during and shortly after the funeral. While Constantine, enrobed in purple and wearing a diadem, received an opulent lying-in-state, hidden from the public eye two camps among Constantine's heirs will have met to discuss his succession.¹³⁰ Constantius, then aged 19, and his close supporters faced Dalmatius, Constantine's powerful brothers and other influential figures in Constantine's government (such as the praetorian prefect Ablabius). Upon hearing of his father's illness, Constantius had hastened north, but during his absence Constantine's close entourage had taken control over Constantine's final days and started with the funeral arrangements, relegating Constantius to the position of spectator.¹³¹

It is likely that Constantius quickly set out to counter their influence on his father's funeral. To his advantage, he probably possessed a good knowledge of the city's procession routes. He had led a secluded childhood within the walls of the imperial palace, but he had left its gates at grand imperial festivals and

¹²⁸ Imperial continuity: Pietri (1989) 125.

¹²⁹ It is debated how Constantius envisaged or prepared his succession: see e.g. Barnes (2011) 163–8; Maraval (2013) 27–9; Chantraine (1992a).

¹³⁰ Eus. *V. Const.* 66–7. Among the daily visitors to the deceased emperor will have been men like the Sicilian senator Flavius Dionysius, Constantine's *comes inter consistorium* in 333: *PLRE* I: 259 (Dionysius 11), whom I discussed in [Chapter 2](#), p. 67.

¹³¹ Transport of Constantine's body to Constantinople: Eus. *V. Const.* 63.2, 65–7, Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.17. Constantius was later blamed for overhastily abandoning the eastern front, perhaps an implicit critique of his involvement in the subsequent dynastic murders: Lib. *Or.* 59. 74–6. Constantius was the only one of the brothers to pay his respects to his father: Jul. *Or.* 1.16c–d.

this was not the first imperial event he had celebrated in the city. Both his appointment to the Caesarship in 324 and his marriage to his cousin took place there;¹³² he will also have participated in Constans' elevation to the Caesarship in 333. Nonetheless, it is difficult to grasp Constantius' role in the funeral arrangements. In Eusebius' colourful account of Constantine's funeral procession, there is little information about Constantius' part in it.¹³³ Eusebius relates that he led the awe-inspiring procession from the palace to the mausoleum and that, at Constantine's mausoleum where his body was laid to rest, 'the new emperor Constantius, honouring his father approximately in this way, by his presence and by the respects paid to him fulfilled the things which the obsequies required' – yet there are no details, quite in contrast to his detailed description of the military personnel who took part in the event.¹³⁴

In Eusebius' account Constantius may be relegated to a secondary role in Constantine's funeral, but he was able to act swiftly and determinedly. Shortly after the funeral and while perhaps still in Constantinople, his soldiers quietly eliminated all possible heirs to the throne except his two brothers Constantine II and Constans and their still very young cousins Julian and Gallus.¹³⁵ The potential rivals were killed alongside their closest supporters, including the imperial tutor Aemilius Magnus Arborius from Toulouse (Tolosa), who had followed Julius Constantius to Constantinople, and Flavius Optatus, consul of 334 and *patricius*, who had taught the sons of Licinius and had been retained by Constantine to teach his sons and

¹³² Date of elevation to the Caesarship: 8 November or 13 November 324: Maraval (2013) 14–15 n. 27. Marriage: Eus. *V. Consti.* 4.49, Jul. *Ad Ath.* 272; on the identity of his wife: Barnes (2011) 171–2; Maraval (2013) 14.

¹³³ Eus. *V. Consti.* 4.68–73.

¹³⁴ Eus. *V. Consti.* 4.70.2 (trans. after Cameron and Hall 1999).

¹³⁵ Jul. *Ad Ath.* 270d, 281b. Constantius as instigator: Jul. *Or.* 1.17a; Zos. 2.40.1–3, but Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.22 stated that the instigators of the murder of Dalmatius are unknown, while Eutrop. 41.18 blamed the troops; with Burgess (2008), esp. pp. 25–6 with more refs, and Klein (1977) 118–38. For the dates and chronology of the death of Constantine, the dynastic murders and the succession of Constantine's sons, I follow largely the chronology offered by Burgess (2008), which is accepted in the discussion of the dynastic murders in Barnes (2011) 168 and Maraval (2013) 24–34.

nephews.¹³⁶ Also assassinated was Constantius' former praetorian prefect Ablabius; probably charged with aspiring to the purple, he was murdered on his estate in Bithynia. His murder was accompanied by that of several other nobles, including possibly the Roman senator Virius Nepotianus, husband of Constantine's sister Eutropia, and the former praetorian prefect and consul Flavius Felicianus, who were also considered a threat to the authority of Constantine's sons, and in particular to Constantius II.¹³⁷

Constantius moved quickly to maintain his newly won position as sole emperor in the East. In August or September 337 he conferred with his brothers in Pannonia and agreed to partition the empire between them.¹³⁸ In this meeting, thanks to a prior arrangement with Constans, he obtained the diocese of Thrace and hence Constantinople, Constans other regions of Dalmatius' former realm; by contrast Constantine II, who had been singled out as heir apparent on Constantinian imperial coinage, was unable to gain new territories.¹³⁹ As a result, on 9 September, the three sons of Constantine were proclaimed Augusti over almost equal shares of the empire. Their rise to

¹³⁶ Arborius: *PLRE* I 98 (Arborius 4) with Hunt (1998) 3 and Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 47–8. Optatus: *Zos.* 2.40.2, see *PLRE* I: 650 (Optatus 3).

¹³⁷ Ablabius: *Eun. Vit.* 6.2.12, 3.7–13, discussed in detail in Burgess (2008) 18. On the possible murder also of Nepotianus (*PLRE* I: 625, Nepotianus 7), and Felicianus (*PLRE* I: 330, Felicianus 5), see Burgess (2008) 10, 19. Felicianus is epigraphically attested as one of the priests of Delphi, on which see Lenski (2016) 216–17. Usually Ablabius' death is dated to late 337/early 338 (e.g. *PLRE* I: 3, Ablabius 4), given Eunapius' slightly upset chronology on this issue, but see Burgess (2008) 31.

¹³⁸ *Jul. Or.* 1.19a, see Barnes (1980) 162.

¹³⁹ Pre-arrangement: Bleckmann (2003a) 230, 241–3. Based on a passage in Aurelius Victor, who claims that, in the division of the empire among the three sons of Constantine, Constans ruled over Africa, Italy, Pannonia, Illyricum, and Thrace, and on one from Zosimus, who holds that the provinces of the Black Sea were held by Constantine II and Constans, it is often wrongly argued that Thrace was not part of the imperial realms of Constantius II, but of that of Constans (*Aur. Vict. Caes.* 41.20; *Zos.* 2.39.2, see also *Jul. Or.* 1.19b–20a). However, given the evidence of Constantius' involvement in the bishopric of Constantinople (the deposing of Paul and his replacement through Eusebius of Nicomedia around 339), as well as the numismatic evidence of the time, it is clear that Thrace had been added to Constantius' domain. For the dating of the reassignment of eastern Thrace to Constantius to 337: Skinner (2008) 143; Bleckmann (2003a) 236; Hunt (1998) 4–5; Barnes (1993) 35; Jones (1964) 1: 112. Also arguing for Thrace as part of Constantius' domain: Maraval (2013) 36–7; Harries (2012) 189; Burgess (2008) 16; Hunt (1998) 4. The division is also implied in Kent's introduction to the coinage of Constantinople in *RIC* VIII p. 441.

imperial rule had been anything but straightforward, and there was a need to legitimize the elimination of their imperial rivals that had made it possible. Upon his return east, Constantius set out to establish his version of Constantine's succession: as the commemorative *solidi* from Constantinople show, Constantius claimed that Constantine was buried as father of three emperors, establishing an unbroken chain of dynastic succession necessary to claim imperial legitimacy.

This rewriting of history not only allowed the dynastic murders to be passed over, but also provided a justification for why they had been necessary: at the time of his funeral, the three new emperors had already been chosen as the only rightful heirs by their father Constantine, who was raised to the gods as 'Father of the Augusti'. Eusebius' account of Constantine's funeral is highly illuminating in this context: Constantius might not seem to have been very actively involved in the procession he described, but in Eusebius' report he is the only relative of Constantine to attend the funeral. Eusebius fails to mention Constantine's two half-brothers, the Caesar Dalmatius, and Hannibalianus, and their families, including the young Gallus and Julian, who may also have been present at the funeral. In a similar vein, Eusebius' Constantius is already the 'new emperor'.¹⁴⁰ It thus appeared that the imperial funeral of Constantine, *pater Augustorum*, had concluded the smooth, dynastic transfer of imperial rule to his three sons, who had been forced to put Constantine's plans into effect by eliminating their dynastic rivals.

Constantine II too was wary of possible criticism of their behaviour, for this motif was integrated into an empire-wide series of bronze commemorative coins. This series paid tribute to the deceased Constantine, who was styled *Pater Augustorum* and represented by a veiled bust on the obverse of the coins.¹⁴¹ Alongside the quadriga motif I have just described, another commemorative motif minted in this series by mints within

¹⁴⁰ Eus. *V. Const.* 4.70.2.

¹⁴¹ On the commemorative coins for Constantine, see e.g. Bonamenste (1988) 121–9; McCormack (1981) 106–32; Schulten (1979); Koep (1958); Bruun (1954); Maurice (1911).

Constantine II's domain shows a cuirassed standing emperor with the legend *AETERNA PIETAS*, eternal piety, an imperial virtue commonly invoked on imperial coinage to underline that the emperor had duly fulfilled his political, religious and social responsibilities.¹⁴² In this case it was probably used to convey that, despite his absence from his father's funeral, Constantine II was a dutiful son and successor to his father, since the soldier motif was produced only by mints under Constantine II's authority and so can easily be identified as a motif unique to that emperor. However, the quadriga motif was minted both in the West under Constantine II and in the East under Constantius II. The differences in the obverse legends of the quadriga coins minted in the West (*DIV(us) CONSTANTINVS P(a)T(er) AVGG(ustorum)* in Trier and *DIVO CONSTANTINO P(atri)AVG(usti)* in Lyons and Arles), which all deviate slightly from the legend used in the East (*D(i)V(us) CONSTANTINVS PT AVGG*), suggest that the motif was produced first by Constantius and then used also in the West in a more uncoordinated manner.¹⁴³ Constantius' legend thus always implied that there was more than one Augustus in the new political order, but Constantine II issued coins in the memory of his deceased father which implied that there was only one imperial successor – himself – for the records of the mint of Lyons include a quadriga coin that referred to Constantine as father of the Augustus, stating the abbreviation *AVG* in the singular: *DIVO CONSTANTINO AVG(usti)*.¹⁴⁴ This is the only coin with this legend, but the tendency to pass over Constantine's brothers is also present in the other legend in the dative case used with the motif (*DIVO CONSTANTINO P*), which denotes Constantine as father but fails to mention his successors. This suggests that in the output of these mints, Constantine II may have sought to challenge or

¹⁴² *AETERNA PIETAS*: *RIC* VIII Trier 37; *RIC* VIII Lyon 1–3; *RIC* VIII Arles 17, 32, 40; for a convenient list, see also Schulten (1979) 153 and Bruun (1954) 26. On *pietas* on imperial coinage, see Noreña (2011) 71–7.

¹⁴³ *RIC* VIII Trier 44, 68; *RIC* VIII Lyons 17, *RIC* VIII Arles 42; for the East, see list at *RIC* VIII 555.

¹⁴⁴ *RIC* VIII Lyons 12.

at least downplay the position of Constans and Constantius in the new imperial order. In this context, the emission of the *AETERNA PIETAS* coins may have represented a direct response to Constantius' highlighted role at the imperial funeral in Constantinople.¹⁴⁵

The idea of Constantine as the Father of the Emperors is also reflected in provincial statue dedications. Dynastic statue monuments showing Constantine alongside his three sons were common in Constantine's lifetime.¹⁴⁶ Eusebius notes that, even after his death, portraits of Constantine were set up throughout the empire to honour the deceased emperor alongside his sons.¹⁴⁷ This implies that after Constantine's death imperial statue monuments emphasized the dynastic element by including Constantine, a claim supported by the epigraphic findings.¹⁴⁸ In this way, as Eusebius realized, the current emperors could claim to be continuing their father's rule, to be Constantine in a new guise.

To return to the coins commemorating Constantine's funeral: while it would seem that there was agreement between the two brothers to mint these posthumous honours for their divinized father, their mint masters took slightly different approaches to both the legend and the motifs used. Bluntly put and as Charles Pietri has noted, while Constantine II celebrated Constantine as a soldier, Constantius was keen on the idea of imperial dynastic succession, 'l'héritage'.¹⁴⁹ The uneven distribution of the reverse motifs of these commemorative coins

¹⁴⁵ The role of Constans in the commemoration of Constantine is difficult to establish. I return to this question below, pp. 161–2.

¹⁴⁶ Moser (2016a) 1235–40.

¹⁴⁷ Eus. *V. Consti.* 72.

¹⁴⁸ Moser (2016a) 1235–40 and Grünewald (1990) nos. 225, 226, 234, 237, 251, 252, 267. On these inscriptions, Constantine is called *pater dominorum* (*CIL* XI 6219 = *ILS* 706 = *LSA* 273) or *pater principum* (*CIL* VI 1148–9 + 31248 + p. 845 = *ILS* 707) rather than *pater Augustorum*. This could be a reflected of the fact that they were set up in an early period, that it prior to September 377 and the proclamation by the senate, when the hierarchy of the three brothers was not yet firmly established, as is suggested e.g. by Grünewald (1990) 161.

¹⁴⁹ Pietri (1989) 125. The absence of consecration coins from the provinces under Constans' nominal sphere of influence is striking, in particular considering that the notion of Constantine as *divus* and Father of Emperors was a powerful one in particular among the Roman elites, as several inscriptions reveal: Moser (2016a) 1236–40.

hence should not be explained as reflecting different religious policies, an idea that is not supported by the evidence.¹⁵⁰ The absence of the *AETERNA PIETAS* motif in the East is rather revealing of Constantius' policy of (ab)using the memory of Constantine. As I show in the next section, in the empire of Constantius the memory of Constantine was upheld as a constant reminder of the imperial legitimacy of Constantius himself. In Constantius' eastern empire, Constantine, Father of the Augusti, was not to rest in peace, but to be used regularly to bolster Constantius' imperial position.

Good Son and Senior Augustus

There is ample evidence for Constantius' use of Constantine to boost his own image. According to Julian, at public meetings Constantius praised Constantine as if he were a beneficent hero-god.¹⁵¹ Similarly, the official rhetor of Constantinople Bemarchius composed a (now lost) *Life of Constantine* sometime before 340.¹⁵² Constantius seems to have approved of his talents and choice of topic, and Bemarchius was sent out on a lecturing tour through the eastern empire. Libanius argued that Bemarchius' sole topic was praising Constantius' splendid new Golden Church in Antioch, dedicated on 6 January 341. Far more likely, his *Life* had shown him to be a loyal supporter of the dynasty and a useful source of praise for Constantius II as a legitimate successor of Constantine. On his tour Bemarchius perhaps also praised the idea of dynastic succession alongside Constantius' achievements more broadly, and may have read the conclusion of the building of the Golden Church as a sign of filial piety and imperial continuity.¹⁵³ Few would have been in a better position to banish the memory of the

¹⁵⁰ Bruun (1954) 27–31 with e.g. Grünewald (1990) 159–62; Bonamente (1988) 124–7; MacCormack (1981) 122–7.

¹⁵¹ Jul. *Or.* 1.46a.

¹⁵² *PLRE* I: 160 (Bemarchius).

¹⁵³ The idea of this being a tour to praise Constantius' achievements, and not only the Church, is also found in Henck (2002) 296. However, he does not link it to the idea of imperial succession.

murders of Constantius' relatives, which may have cast doubt on Constantius' filial piety. Also illuminating in this context is Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*, composed as a verbal portrait in memory of the deceased ruler.¹⁵⁴ Here too Constantine is a model to emulate and a source of imperial legitimacy.¹⁵⁵ Constantine also figures prominently in Libanius' Oration 59 from this period.¹⁵⁶

The memory of Constantine also figures prominently on Constantius' coinage in this period. Two traits are of particular interest. First there is Constantius' marked insistence on venerating the memory of Constantine alongside celebrations of his military prowess and of the length of his own reign and that of Constans. The second interesting trait is his continuous use of the Alexandresque portrait reintroduced by Constantine. Around 342 Constantius produced a series of small bronze coins with a notable motif: a veiled Constantine with the legend *DV CONSTANTINVS PT AVGG* (*divus Constantinus pater Augustorum*), 'deified Father of the Emperors', on the obverse; on its reverse a female figure representing Aequitas (Fairness) is shown standing to the left, holding a balance and a scroll together with the legend *IVST VEN MEM* or *IVST VENER MEMOR* (*iusta ueneranda memorial iustae uenerandae memoriae* or *iuste ueneranda memoria*).¹⁵⁷ The reverse legend reminded the viewer that the deceased Constantine, Father of the Emperors, was rightly remembered.

On imperial coinage Aequitas was employed to highlight the justice of Constantius' decision-making, and in a more specific sense the honest administration of the imperial mint in the East. This was an important message, given that the monetary

¹⁵⁴ Eus. *V. Const.* 1.10–11.

¹⁵⁵ For contemporary conceptions of the role of the emperor in the empire more generally as reflected in contemporary panegyric and similar sources, see Maraval (2013) 175–7.

¹⁵⁶ On the dynastic element, see in particular Malosse (2003). On the speech more generally, see also Portmann (2002); Seiler (1998) esp. 19–72; Wiemer (1994); and Callu (1987).

¹⁵⁷ *RIC* VIII Heraclea 41; *RIC* VIII Constantinople 62; *RIC* VIII Nicomedia 45; *RIC* VIII Cyzicus 35; *RIC* VIII Antioch 64; *RIC* VIII Alexandria 28, which bears the legend *IVST VENER MEMOR*. Date accepted by Maraval (2013) 65; Pietri (1989) 128. *Iuste ueneranda memoria*: Grünewald (1990) 161.

economy and its stability depended on the imperial mint. Earlier research has underlined that no motif was better suited to have ‘advertised the moral economy of imperial rule’.¹⁵⁸ The linking of this message with the image of Constantine powerfully highlighted Constantius’ message that he was the legitimate and successful successor to his father who could guarantee a stable economy.

When was the *IVST VEN MEN/Aequitas* coin minted? With reference to the veiled bust of Constantine depicted on their obverse, it is often argued that these *IVST VEN MEM* coins (and also the subsequent *VN MR* ones discussed below) were minted as part of the initial consecration bronze series of 337.¹⁵⁹ However, there are problems with this dating. First, it appears that these coins were part of a series that included at least one other coin with a different motif. These accompanying coins, celebrating the victoriousness of the emperor, *VICT(oria) AVG(usti)*, were issued only in the name of Constans and Constantius, strongly suggesting that the series was minted after the death of Constantine II in 340.¹⁶⁰ What is more, one of the accompanying coins celebrated Constantius’ twentieth imperial anniversary, either as Caesar around 342 or as Augustus around 346/7.¹⁶¹ If these two coins were minted alongside each other, then the *IVST VEN MEM* must be located in the (early) 340s.¹⁶² The *IVST VEN MEM/Aequitas* coin thus proclaimed the infallible success of Constantius’ dynastic succession, another facet to the way Constantius (ab) used the memory of Constantine to boost his own image as a legitimate emperor.

¹⁵⁸ On *aequitas* in imperial coinage, see Noreña (2011) 63–71, citation on 71. It is not impossible that, as MacCormack (1981) 123 has proposed, the image was used also to denote the equitable division of Constantine’s heritage among his three sons.

¹⁵⁹ Bonamente (1988) 123–8; MacCormack (1981) 122–3; Bruun (1954) 26; Maurice (1911) e.g. 548.

¹⁶⁰ *RIC VIII* 433 Heraclea 42–3; *RIC VIII* Constantinople 63–6; *RIC VIII* Nicomedia 46–7; *RIC VIII* Cyzicus 36–7; *RIC VIII* Antioch 65–6; *RIC VIII* Alexandria 29–31.

¹⁶¹ For the difficulty of dating the *vota* celebrations of Constantius in this period, see Kent (1981) 51.

¹⁶² Kent (1981) 452; Schulten (1979) 155–6.

Remembering Constantine



FIGURE 4.3 Bronze coin, (a) obverse showing a veiled bust of Constantine I, (b) reverse a veiled, toga-clad figure with the legend *V(e)N(eranda) M(emo)R(ia)*. MK RÖ 69509.

By permission of the KHM, Wien.

Probably around 346/7 Constantius issued a much larger, slightly more expensive series of such commemorative coins. This time the obverse of the Constantinian coin bore a slightly abbreviated legend (*VN MR*, *veneranda memoria*) and instead of the Aequitas motif showed a veiled figure standing to the right (Figure 4.3). This standing figure has been interpreted as the veiled figure of Constantine.¹⁶³ However, I find an identification of this figure with *Pietas*, the personification of (imperial) piety, more convincing.¹⁶⁴ Alternatively, it could represent both: the piety of Constantine, as well as that of his sons in commemorating him. These *Pietas* commemorative pieces were accompanied by coins celebrating the duration of the reigns of the ruling emperors, in this case their imperial anniversaries of 346/8: it shows a wreath which contains references to the imperial anniversaries that the two emperors celebrated in this year, Constantius his twenty-fifth and Constans his twentieth imperial year.¹⁶⁵ Confusingly, in most mints the *vota imperii*,

¹⁶³ Bonamente (1988) 122; Kent (1981) e.g. 452; Schulten (1979) 156.

¹⁶⁴ This identification is offered by MacCormack (1981) 122–3; Bruun (1954) 26; Maurice (1911) e.g. 548.

¹⁶⁵ For this double *VN MR* / *vota* bronze coin series, see *RIC* VIII Heraclea 44–60; *RIC* VIII Constantinople 68–77; *RIC* VIII Nicomedia 48–59; *RIC* VIII Cyzicus 46–64; *RIC* VIII Antioch 112–20; *RIC* VIII Alexandria 32–43.

vows celebrated on the occasion of imperial anniversaries, are given as *VOT(is) XX MVLT(is) XXX*, so this would indicate a date of 342/3, but the issue in Antioch shows Constans with *VOT XV MVLT XX*, dating it to his *quindecennalia* in 347.¹⁶⁶ While the emphasis was on the duration of the reigns of Constantius and Constans, the impetus was similar to that of the earlier *IVST VEN MEMIVictoria Augusti* series: both series proclaimed that their dynastic succession was both legitimate and highly successful.

There were also more subtle references to the Constantinian heritage. One year earlier in 346, to coincide with his great victory over Shapur II who had unsuccessfully besieged Nisibis, Constantius had distributed a small issue of special siliquae in Antioch to celebrate the brothers' imperial anniversaries. Interestingly, while he also minted coins celebrating Constans' *quindecennalia* alongside those celebrating his *VOT(is) XX MVLT(is) XXX*, both show Constantius on the obverse: no example has been found that shows Constans.¹⁶⁷ On these coins the emperor is shown in the style of a Hellenistic ruler portrait, thereby linking him to a traditional Hellenistic ruler, and in particular to Alexander the Great (Figure 4.4).

The coins were consciously drawing on a type that had been reintroduced by Constantine, and the same motif had been used for a series minted in 337, the first reuse of the Hellenistic portrait type after Constantine's death. In it the three ruling emperors presented themselves as legitimate successors of Constantine.¹⁶⁸ As has rightly been remarked by Johannes Wienand, on these siliquae the young emperors are also shown with an aquiline nose, the famous Roman nose also employed by Constantine, thereby stressing their 'inherited charisma with exceptional vividness'.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ *RIC* VIII: 428.

¹⁶⁷ *RIC* VIII Nicomedia 35–6.

¹⁶⁸ Wienand (2015) 432–4.

¹⁶⁹ The citation is taken from Wienand (2015) 434. Wienand examines the later use of this Alexandresque motif, minted by Constantius II in Antioch in 346, *RIC* VIII Antioch 35 + 36.

Remembering Constantine



FIGURE 4.4 Silver coin (siliqua), obverse depicting a diademed Constantianus II in 'Alexandresque' portrait. 1950,1006.1588.

© The Trustees of the British Museum.

Yet the interest in stressing such dynastic links was not shared equally among the Augusti after 337: the list of mints participating in this silver series suggests that Constantianus II was particularly keen on it, and had these coins produced throughout his realms.¹⁷⁰ More difficult to explain is the participation pattern of the other mints. The mints under Constantine II's direct authority in Gaul did not participate in this series, while in Siscia and Rome, the Alexandresque series was minted, but only in the names of Constantine II and Constantianus.¹⁷¹ Whatever the reasons for Constans' absence, an

¹⁷⁰ *RIC VIII* Heraclea 11–12 (only for Constantianus II and Constans); *RIC VIII* Constantinople 15–20 (all three emperors); *RIC VIII* Nicomedia 3 (only Constantianus II); *RIC VIII* Cyzicus 1–2 (only Constantine II and Constantianus II); *RIC VIII* Antioch 32–4 (only Constantine II and Constantianus II); *RIC VIII* 538 Alexandria 1–3 (all three emperors).

¹⁷¹ *RIC VIII* Siscia 53–6 (Alexandresque motif used only for Constantine II); Rome: *RIC VIII* Rome 1, 1A (only Constantine II and Constantianus II).

explanation is needed for why the Alexandresque siliquae were minted in Rome in 337 in his brothers' names.¹⁷² Constantine II may have used this series to further downplay the role of his brother emperor Constans. It is also not difficult to see what Constantius' interest would be in the production of these coins in Rome: given his reliance on Roman senators for his administration in the East, as discussed in [Chapter 3](#), there was a need to emphasize his dynastic legitimacy as ruler of the Roman Empire alongside Constantine II (or Constans) to this public in particular, right from the start of his rule. Constantius could use the motif to encourage the Roman senatorial elites to hold office in the East where he ruled as a new Constantine.

To return to Constantius' coinage during the joint reign with Constans, an extremely late employment of the memory of Constantine, in 346, by Constantius may perhaps have been a reflection of the fraternal conflict over Athanasius, in which the latter's return to Alexandria in 346 was understood as a sign of weakness on the part of Constantius. The latter may therefore have sought to bolster his senior position in their relationship by reusing this emblematic motif and styling himself *Maximus Augustus* on it.

But Constantius vied not only with his father: like Constantine, he was also a match for Alexander the Great.¹⁷³ The allusion to Alexander in the coin series discussed above is paralleled in several works written in the early 340s that favourably compare Constantius to Alexander the Great. Two such contemporary panegyric narratives on Alexander's Persian wars have been preserved in Latin. The first is the *Itinerarium Alexandri*, written probably in 340 by the Roman senator Flavius Julius Valerius Alexander Polemius, a *comes* of Constantius.¹⁷⁴ The text glorifies Constantius' future

¹⁷² On the absence of Constans in this coinage, see Callu (1986) 187–8, 192. I propose to return to his role in the commemoration of Constantine in a future paper.

¹⁷³ Wienand (2015) 433.

¹⁷⁴ On this text and author, see Wienand (2015) 434–7, Cameron (2011) 560; Davies (1998); Lane Fox (1997), and Callu (1992). I discuss the identity of the author in detail in [Chapter 3](#), pp. 112–13.

invasion of Persian territory and urges the young emperor, a ‘new Alexander’ in his youth and physique, to emulate the admirable conqueror in his imminent summer campaign. As well as the *Itinerarium*, there is also the first Latin translation of the Greek Alexander Romance, the so-called *Res gestae Alexandri Macedonis*, a work which may also have been produced by Polemius.¹⁷⁵ Evidently the Alexander story was in high favour among court circles at Antioch in the early 340s. Besides these two Latin works – which highlight the Latin proficiency of Constantius’ court and, indeed, their interest in Latin literature – there was also a major Greek work on the Macedonian king: Praxagoras’ *Life of Alexander*, written in the early 340s.¹⁷⁶ This is known to have been in six books, and was thus the most substantial Alexander narrative of the fourth century.¹⁷⁷ Like the *Itinerarium*, Praxagoras’ *Alexander* was probably dedicated to Constantius II. It is likely that many panegyrics delivered at various festive occasions sang a similar Alexandresque tune. At the same time these works perhaps also reveal the hopes of the educated elite in this period. Members of his court as well as provincial elites, like the Athens-based Praxagoras, were part of this enterprise to glorify Constantius’ military abilities and prospective victories. Indeed, given that Polemius was a senator, Rome too may have revelled in being ruled by a new Alexander: Constantius’ Roman praetorian prefect in the early 340s, Septimius Acindynus, as well as his *comites Orientis* at the time, notably Placidus and Vulcacius Rufinus, will certainly have enjoyed the idea of serving such a promising emperor and will have reported Constantius’ Alexandresque military enterprises on their return to Rome. What is important in this context is that in at least one of these texts, the *Itinerarium* by Polemius, Constantinian descent is used to explain why Constantius’ surpassed Alexander

¹⁷⁵ Cameron (2011) 560.

¹⁷⁶ Date: Barnes (2011) 197 with further refs; Smith (2007a) 373 argues for a date of composition between 336 and 346.

¹⁷⁷ Smith (2007a) 373.

in his military successes, a message that was also highlighted by the reuse of the Alexandresque motif.¹⁷⁸

Taken together, these bronze and silver coin series and the panegyrics on Constantine and Alexander are clear testimonies to Constantius' policy of using the memory of his popular father to strengthen his own position in Rome and in the eastern empire throughout his early reign. While Constantine II had shown some interest in exploiting the memory of his father for his own legitimation in the *DIVVS CONSTANTINVS* series in 337, the lack of interest on the part of Constans in employing coinage for such purposes means that Constantius was the only emperor to produce coin series that expressively commemorated Constantine in their legends and motifs after 340. By invoking the memory of Constantine these coins are a numismatic promise of continuity, order and good rulership. Yet it would be wrong to conclude that with these commemorative series Constantius II sought only to underline that he was the rightful successor to Constantine; indeed, most of the *VENERANDA MEMORIA* bronze series were also minted in the name of his brother. Constantius was presenting himself rather as the senior Augustus.

To summarize, the last two sections have revealed the key role of the memory of Constantine in Constantius' imperial ideology. His coinage shows that Constantius used the memory of his father to boost his position as emperor in the East. Reference to Constantine allowed Constantius to present himself as a legitimate and successful successor in the East; it was also invoked to underline his senior position against Constans. It is in this context that Constantius' attitude to Constantinople must be located. He promoted Constantinople to his nominal capital, investing in its urban fabric, teaching facilities and urban council because this commitment could be presented as an act of filial piety and of imperial legitimacy. Like the image of Constantine, it became a core subject of imperial ideology. Constantius himself promoted the notion of Constantinople

¹⁷⁸ *Itin. Alex.* 4 (10), discussed with reference to the Alexandresque coinage in Wienand (2015) 434–6.

as a symbol of his rule. On imperial coinage, the personification of Constantinople came to symbolize Constantius' eastern empire, as is implied by the twin-city motif discussed in the introduction of this chapter (Figure 4.1). Given that the motif was at first minted only in Constantius' imperial realm, the addition of Rome and the emission of similar coins for Constans is notable: it strongly implies that its message was one of unity, not division, in that Constantius claimed the senior position in a unified empire.¹⁷⁹

The strong link between Constantinople and Constantius' imperial success was not only expressed in coinage, however. More significant still is Constantius' policy of celebrating important imperial events and anniversaries in great pomp in Constantinople, if possible in the presence of the emperor.¹⁸⁰ The introduction of new regulations for the praetorian games in Constantinople in 340 for instance were published in such a way that their reading coincided with the imperial anniversary of Constantius and Constans in this year (as discussed earlier). It has also possible that Constantius moved to Constantinople in 345 to celebrate the launch of his bathing complex, the *Thermae Constantianae*.¹⁸¹ The perhaps more glamorous entry of Constantius into Constantinople occurred in 346. In the spring of that year, following his success on the eastern front in the previous years, the emperor entered the city in a glittering *adventus*, celebrating the twenty-fifth jubilee of his elevation to the imperial throne in the very city in which he had been raised to this rank in 324.¹⁸² He is recorded in the

¹⁷⁹ Note that no example of the twin-city motif minted in the name of Constans has survived from western mints, strongly suggesting that the preserved coins with this motif postdate his death and were then used for the same purpose, to highlight the unity of the empire and Constantius' legitimacy as emperor following the defeat of Magnentius: e.g. *RIC VIII* 166 nos. 338–46 (Trier); *RIC VIII* 189 nos. 177–9 (Lyon); *RIC VIII* 269 no. 225A–230 (Rome); *RIC VIII* 332 nos. 179–81 (Aquilaia); *RIC VIII* 370 nos. 297–8 (Siscia); *RIC VIII* 384 nos. 1–9 (Sirmium).

¹⁸⁰ For the chronology of Constantius' returns to Constantinople, see my discussion above, pp. 131–2.

¹⁸¹ *Chron. Pasch.* a. 345, p. 34, lines 16–19. This possibility is noted in Destephen (2016) 358 and Seeck (1919) 192. Pfeilschifter (2013) 42 n. 3 and Barnes (1993) 220 are more sceptical.

¹⁸² Return to Constantinople in 346: this is suggested by a coin series minted this year, which contains the following pieces: *RIC VIII* Constantinople 55; Cyzicus: CNG

city on 26 May and 27 August 346, suggesting that he spent a prolonged period of four months in Constantinople. Two laws indicate that Constantius returned to the city in 349, perhaps to celebrate his twenty-fifth anniversary in 348/9, an event that was also celebrated in coins issued in Constantinople as well as Nicomedia and Cyzicus, perhaps an indication of the route taken by Constantius on this journey from Antioch.¹⁸³

Conclusion

This chapter has investigated the role of Constantinople in Constantius' early empire between 337 and 350. In this period, Constantius' court resided in Antioch, which profited greatly from the continuous presence of the emperor and his court, as the discussion also of the rich output of the mints of the city revealed. The urban population knew how to benefit from the presence of the emperor, either by forging marriage or property links with Constantius' wealthy entourage, or by enjoying the emperor's largess also in the theatres and circus. The residence in Antioch carried another benefit: it allowed a clear break with the Constantinian establishment, which the new emperor had so resolutely removed. Indeed, Constantius was not *like* Constantine: he was a *new* Constantine. Over the following decade, while not returning to its former importance as the main imperial residence, Constantinople nonetheless established itself in the league of renowned cities of the East. This was possible thanks to Constantius' investments in the urban infrastructure, the administrative promotion of the province to one that was ruled by a senatorial

Auction Triton 8, lot 1259; *RIC* VIII (Nicomedia) 26–8; *RIC* VIII (Antioch) 79; see Wienand (2015) 425 n. 7 and 432 n. 33. *CTh* 11.16.6 on the privileges of the *palatini* and the citizens of Constantinople is sometimes dated to 7 May 346 (Maraval, 2013, 178), but I agree with Seeck (1919) 41 that it is best located in 335, since its addressee Veronicianus also received *CTh* 8.1.4 and *CTh* 8.15.2 from Constantine on 19 May 334.

¹⁸³ *CTh* 12.2.1 = *CJ* 10.37.1; *CTh* 15.1.6 = *CJ* 8.11.2 (3 October 349). Coins: *RIC* VIII Constantinople 60–1; *RIC* VIII Nicomedia 40–4; *RIC* VIII Cyzicus 43–4, and *RIC* VIII Antioch 97–8 with *RIC* VIII 504–5. For the route taken, see discussion in Wienand (2015) 432.

Remembering Constantine

proconsul, and the imperially driven promotion of teaching facilities. Ten years after the funeral of Constantine and the dynastic murders, the place was bustling with teachers and students drawn from all over the eastern provinces. These investments, I argue, were part of Constantius' policy of using the memory of Constantine as a sign of filial piety to promote his imperial position against his co-ruling brothers in the West. The commemoration of Constantine was a major component of Constantius' imperial ideology at the time. It was expressed in coinage, panegyrics, inscriptions and the so-called praetorships of Constantinople: here, too, Constantius was keen to emphasize his privileged access to the Constantinian heritage.

These measures for and about Constantinople must also be seen against the background of the role of Rome in Constantius' early reign, as explored in [Chapter 3](#). This revealed that Constantius was reliant on senatorial support from Rome, and that Rome was still a source of meaningful political support, in particular in the rivalry with Constans. Thus, though Rome was in Constans' domain, Constantius could at least boast of Constantinople and the Constantinian heritage it represented. His reverence for Constantine may in turn have worked as a way to attract support from the Roman aristocracy which, so the inscriptions from Italy and Greece suggest, remained firmly attached to the deceased emperor. Significantly, Constantinople was used to promote his image also in Rome.¹⁸⁴ It is likely that it was introduced to Roman coinage at the demand of Constantius, who aimed to remind Rome of his rule and of the attractions of his eastern empire. This suggests that Constantius' investments in Constantinople may also have been directed at this audience in Rome: senators in Constans' realm should rest assured that Constantius would pursue his father's Rome-friendly policies in the East, and that he was keen to award them high honours in his government.

¹⁸⁴ *RIC* VIII Rome 361–9 from 337 to 340. For Constans a medallion was minted *ROMA BEATA*: *RIC* VIII Rome 372. Later medallions, minted c. 347/8: *RIC* VIII Rome 392, 396–8 and Kent (1978) 110–11. Inscriptions: Moser (2016a) 1235–40.

Ruling the East (AD 337–350)

In short, in this period Constantinople was securely put on the map of important cities in the East, and it had found a new purpose: like no other city, it was used as a platform to venerate Constantius' filial piety to Constantine and, through it, his imperial glory and power.

PART III

RULER OF ROME AND
CONSTANTINOPLE (AD 350–361)

CRISIS AND INNOVATION

Between Magnentius and Gallus

In January 350 the western emperor Constans was overthrown in a military coup led by his *magister militum* Magnentius. The usurpation of Magnentius is usually not considered to have prompted important political changes in the empire, but, as I argue in this chapter, this view is mistaken: the usurpation of Magnentius prompted Constantius, now cut off from access to the senate of Rome for the first time, to create a substitute imperial senate in Constantinople. Fabius Titianus, who had been proconsul of Asia and consul (in 337) under Constantine, and had served Constans for seven years as praetorian prefect in Gaul, became a key figure in the government of the usurper. He took up office in Rome on 27 February 350, ousting Constantius' last prefect Hermogenes from Rome.¹ The appointment of Titianus was a strategic move by Magnentius: as ruler of Rome he was able not only to force Constantius to accept him as a co-ruler but also to claim legitimacy through the support of the senate of Rome, and to deprive Constantius of it. Constantius was not willing to concede these demands. At the same time, given his military obligations on the eastern front, Constantius' scope for action in response to the event was limited. As an open confrontation was not possible, Constantius did not clearly refuse joint rule with Magnentius, and agreed to engage in diplomatic talks. This created uncertainty which gave rise to two further usurpations aiming to re-establish a member of the Constantinian dynasty in the West.² One revolt occurred in Rome, when in January

¹ *PLRE* I: 918 (Titianus 6).

² On the usurpations of Magnentius, Nepotianus and Vetricianus, e.g. *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 41.25–42.16; *Eutrop.* 10.11–12; *Jul. Or.* 1–2; *Them. Or.* 2–4; and the overview

350 Nepotianus, a senatorial cousin of Constantius, supported by several Roman senators, rebelled against Magnentius, allegedly with the aim of restoring Constantinian rule in the West. The second usurpation took place in Illyricum when, on 1 March 350, the powerful and experienced legions hailed their aged general Vetranio as emperor, again allegedly in order to assist the dynasty of Constantine.³

In response to these events Constantius put in place several political arrangements to secure his position against these threats and, eventually, to defeat his rivals. In this chapter I aim in particular to establish the role of the senatorial elites in this period: who rallied to support Constantius in this endeavour? At the time, he had no hold over Rome, so it was probably no longer possible to rally Roman senators to the cause.

The chapter falls into five sections. The first discusses Constantius' relationship with the Roman senate and some of its more influential members in this period. As will be shown, this was not straightforward: many senators supported his cause, yet their power also forced him to grant them important authority in his government, in particular by sending his cousin Gallus as Caesar to Antioch, while Constantius moved his court to Illyricum. The following sections then examine the several measures put in place to stabilize this complex arrangement. Continuing the prosopographical study presented in the [previous chapters](#), the second section, 'The Eastern Guard', offers an overview of the known senatorial officials of Constantius at the court of Gallus and in the eastern administration more broadly in this period (350 to 354), in order to gauge the effect of Magnentius' hold on Rome and the ensuing civil war on Constantius' relationship with Rome. The next two sections look more closely at a series of honorary statues dedicated to the praetorian prefect Philippus, a central figure in Constantius' government. As I show in the third section,

provided in Frakes (2012) 100–3; Drinkwater (2000); Bleckmann (1999a), (1994); Hunt (1998) 14–22; Rubin (1998); Vanderspoel (1995) 84–7 with refs. On usurpations in the fourth century more generally: Szidat (2010); Wardman (1994).

³ *Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 350; *Jul. Or.* 1.26c; *Zos.* 2.43.1. Modern treatments of the revolt of Vetranio include Dearn (2003); Drinkwater (2000); Bleckmann (1994).

an unpublished inscription from Perge belonging to this statue series yields vital insights into the promotion of the senate of Constantinople during the usurpation of Magnentius. The fourth section, ‘Statues of Loyalty’, examines the statue series in general, in order to investigate the wider political context of the series and the career of the prefect Philippus. In sum, these sections suggest that Constantius created a substitute senate in Constantinople to legitimize his position against Magnentius in Rome.

Why was the senate founded in Constantinople and not Antioch? I suggest this must be explained with reference to the symbolic importance of Constantinople: as discussed earlier, in the previous decade Constantius had begun to use the city on the Bosphorus as a basis to bolster his political position against the West. Four panegyrics examined in the fifth and final section reveal that this policy was continued during the campaign against Magnentius: Constantius claimed that in fighting the western usurpers he was restoring the Constantinian heritage. In this context Constantinople was used, again, as a symbol of Constantius’ quality as restorer of peace and stability, an argument that gained further strength and persuasiveness through the establishment of a substitute senate.

Usurpations in the West

This section offers a brief introduction to Constantius’ relationship with the Roman senate and its membership after the usurpation of Magnentius against Constans in January 350. As noted above, two further usurpations took place shortly after these events. Nepotianus, the son of Constantine’s sister Eutropia, was proclaimed emperor in Rome in early 350 in a direct challenge to Magnentius.⁴ Nepotianus claimed to be fighting for the restoration of Constantinian rule in the West, and seems to have rallied a considerable number of senators to his cause. However, the revolt lacked the necessary military

⁴ *PLRE* I: 624 (Nepotianus 5); *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 6–8; *Eutrop.* 10.11; *Zos.* 2.43.2–4; and Maraval (2013) 93–5 and Ehling (2001).

resources. The conventional view is that Nepotianus came to power in June 350, and that Magnentius was able to subdue this minor usurpation after only a few weeks. Yet, as Bruno Bleckmann has demonstrated in his re-examination of the textual evidence, Nepotianus' usurpation occurred earlier, in January 350, and so perhaps in direct response to the rise of Magnentius.⁵ It is likely that Nepotianus ruled for four to five months, and thus represented a considerable threat to Magnentius. The seriousness of this Roman usurpation also explains why Magnentius imposed such harsh punishment on Nepotianus' senatorial supporters, including confiscations and trials.⁶

In March 350 the troops of Illyricum acclaimed their general Vetranio emperor. Vetranio's usurpation represented a further challenge to Constantius' position in the East, especially to his authority over the army. Two important figures, relatives of Constantius, were deeply involved in this usurpation. First, there was Vulcacius Rufinus. This brother of Galla, who was the wife of Julius Constantius and aunt of the emperor Constantius, had been able to rise to great authority in the previous decade. Rufinus had been one of Constantius' most important officeholders in the early 340s as *comes Orientis* with authority, including inappellate jurisdiction, in Egypt and Mesopotamia, and had participated in Constantius' *concilium* as *comes primi ordinis intra consistorium*; he had then been appointed by Constans as praetorian prefect in Italy around 344 and later also in Illyricum.⁷ Rufinus was an ambitious man: together with Constantius' sister Constantina, he supported the usurpation of Vetranio in Sirmium in March 350, serving as Vetranio's praetorian prefect. Constantina perhaps hoped to gain a share in imperial power herself. Later sources would claim that she had encouraged Vetranio's usurpation as a way to strengthen Constantius' position. Constantina certainly knew the precariousness of imperial rule: she had

⁵ Bleckmann (2003b) 46 n. 7.

⁶ Eutrop. 10.11.2 calls the proscriptions *gravissimae*. Similar events are narrated by Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 42.6–8.

⁷ *PLRE I*: 782 (Rufinus 25) and my discussion of his career in Chapter 3, p. 94.

been married to Hannibalianus, who had been elevated to the rank of *rex regum et ponticarum gentium* by Constantine in 335 before being killed in the dynastic murders in Constantinople in 337,⁸ and as a member of the imperial family resident in Rome, where she had returned in the meantime, Constantina had a strong personal interest in the survival of Constantinian rule.⁹ Together she and Rufinus may also have supported the appointment as Caesar of Gallus, Rufinus' nephew, and her own marriage to this new Caesar, to which I shall return in a moment.¹⁰

First, to return to Vetranio. Constantius seems to have recognized the authority of the general, perhaps in order to install him temporarily as a convenient support until Constantius himself was able to leave the East and move west.¹¹ In the event the two parties (or at least Constantius' and Vetranio's entourages, perhaps without the knowledge of the general himself – the fact that Rufinus stayed in office even after Vetranio's fall is at any rate suspicious) managed to turn the situation to good account: following negotiations during the autumn, Vetranio abdicated in front of the assembled troops shortly after Constantius' arrival in Sirmium in December 350.¹²

In early 351, reinforced by Illyrican troops, Constantius rejected the advice of his close councillors (some right-thinking men, *recte sentientes quidam*, so Ammianus) to avoid civil war by accepting Magnentius' terms as proposed in an embassy in 350 and moved to confront his illegitimate rival (as Constantius claimed) and declared war.¹³ On 15 March 351 Constantius elevated his cousin Gallus to the rank of Caesar, a clear statement that he was unwilling to share rule with Magnentius

⁸ *PLRE* I: 407 (Hannibalianus 2).

⁹ *PLRE* I: 222 (Constantina 2). On role of Constantina, see Maraval (2013) 88–92; Bleckmann (1994).

¹⁰ Bleckmann (1994) 56–9.

¹¹ Hunt (1998) 16. Julian (*Jul. Or.* 1.30b–c) reports that Constantius supported Vetranio with money and troops.

¹² Smooth end of Vetranio's usurpation: *Jul. Or.* 1.30d–32a, 2.76d–77c; *Them. Or.* 4.56b; *Zos.* 2.44.3–4.

¹³ *Amm.* 21.16.12; also *Them. Or.* 4.62b; *Jul. Or.* 1.41d.

on the given terms.¹⁴ In late 350 to early 351 Magnentius had declared his intention to remain on the imperial throne by appointing his relative Decentius as Caesar.¹⁵ Magnentius had married Justina, who may have been related to Constantine (after her husband's downfall she would marry Valentinian, the later emperor); if so, Magnentius was improving his credentials as a legitimate successor of Constantine.¹⁶ Gallus' position, too, was strengthened by a strategic marriage: invested as Caesar at Constantine's birthplace Sirmium, he was married to Constantina.¹⁷ Gallus also received the emperor's name: he became Caesar Flavius Claudius Constantius Gallus.¹⁸ Despite the circumstances, the appointment was celebrated with due festivities, including a panegyric by the orator Himerius, who had travelled from Constantinople to Sirmium to celebrate the event.¹⁹

In the following months Constantius' court prepared for war. The first major encounter took place at the battle of Mursa in September 351, following unsuccessful attempts to prevent war through a diplomatic solution: two later sources hold that Constantius offered to accept Magnentius as a co-ruler in Gaul, if he would cede Italy to Constantius.²⁰ The mission failed, and war ensued.²¹ Both sides suffered severe losses at Mursa, which was one of the bloodiest in the history of the Roman Empire, even though the resulting depletion of Roman fighting capacity can be overstated.²² Constantius won an important victory, but Magnentius was still able to hold

¹⁴ The embassy in mid-350 was led by the senator and Magnentius' praetorian prefect Nunechius, *PLRE* I: 635 (Nunechius), and a certain Maximus: *PLRE* I: 581 (Maximus 12).

¹⁵ *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 42.9–11. For dating the elevation of Decentius to late 350 or early 351, see Bleckmann (2003b) 46 and Barnes (1996) 102. For Decentius being the brother of Magnentius, see *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 42.10 and Bleckmann (1999b).

¹⁶ *PLRE* I: 488 (Iustina). A suggestion made by Barnes (1996) 102.

¹⁷ *Eutrop.* 42.1; *Philost.* 3.25; *Soc.* 2.28.21; *Soz.* 4.4.4.

¹⁸ Name: *Amm.* 14.1.1; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 42.2.

¹⁹ Barnes (1987a) 209.

²⁰ *Zon.* 13.8.7; *Zos.* 2.46.3; see Bleckmann (1999a) 81–2.

²¹ On the (late) Christian readings of this conflict, see Bleckmann (1999a) 58–68 with refs.

²² Battle: *Abdy* (2012) 594; *Maraval* (2013) 103–11; *Potter* (2004) 473–4; *Hunt* (1998) 20. Losses: Bleckmann (1999a) 92–3.

Italy, Africa and Gaul, and Constantius' advance into Italy was halted by the mountainous region near Emona.²³ The conflict with Magnentius was thus far from being resolved, and more efforts were necessary to defeat the usurper and establish Constantius' rule in the West, and in particular to regain Rome.

Important political alliances were forged with Rome. Following Magnentius' defeat at Mursa, many senators defected to Constantius, and Magnentius' position in Rome became more difficult, as is suggested by the unusually quick succession of urban prefects.²⁴ Clodius Celsinus signo Adelphius, for instance, had agreed to serve Magnentius as urban prefect in March 351, but was deposed in December and accused of aspiring to the purple.²⁵ To exculpate her family, his wife, the senatorial poet Faltonia Betitia Proba, author of the *Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi*, composed an epic verse celebration of Constantius' war against the usurper and of the restoration of stability in Rome and in the lives of its senators.²⁶ Not even Constantine's key Roman supporter Proculus was able to turn the tide and reconcile Rome with the usurper during his second urban prefecture from 18 December 351 to 9 September 352.²⁷

In this period the senate sent an official embassy, led by Memmius Orfitus, to Constantius' court to congratulate him on his victory at Mursa. Julian implies that many senators pitched their camp with Constantius in Sirmium after the battle, but it seems that the support was lukewarm at first, given the difficult circumstances. Only two distinguished senators can be

²³ Bleckmann (2003b) 55.

²⁴ Urban prefects of Magnentius, see Chastagnol (1962) 131–5; Magnentius' unpopularity in Rome: Zos. 2.53.2 with Hunt (1998) 21; Chastagnol (1960) 418–22. Defection of senators after battle of Mursa: Bleckmann (1999) 69–74 with reference to Jul. Or. 1.48b and 3.97b. Rubin (1998) assesses the religious aspects of Magnentius' usurpation.

²⁵ Date of office: Maraval (2013) 87; Chastagnol (1962) 131–4, no. 55; *PLRE* I: 192 (Adelphius 6) = 193 (Adelphius 7).

²⁶ Poems of Proba and her identity: Cameron (2011) 327–37; Bleckmann (1999) 69–74; Matthews (1992) 291–2.

²⁷ *PLRE* I: 747 (Proculus 11). I return to the issue of the defection of Roman senators to Constantius in Chapter 7, pp. 279, 309. On Magnentius' early reign, see Maraval (2013) 81–3 and Barnes (1996) 101–5.

documented as active supporters of Constantius' endeavour to take control of Rome and the West.²⁸ In any case, the battle of Mursa had revealed that Magnentius would not be defeated by words alone. A major synchronized assault on his strongholds in the West was necessary to eliminate him. In the following months Constantius assembled a fleet so that he could send his troops to Italy, Africa and Spain to establish a hold on these strategic regions while preparing for the major encounter with Magnentius in Gaul.²⁹ According to Libanius, Magnentius' strength forced Constantius to ask several German *foederati*, including the Alamani, to wage war on Magnentius in Germany and Gaul.³⁰ To use barbarian tribes as mercenaries in war was not an uncommon military tactic; nonetheless, it reveals the seriousness of the situation.³¹

Constantius remained firm in his refusal to accept Magnentius as co-ruler. Having set his mind on defeating Magnentius in Gaul, he sent Gallus and Constantina, who had until then remained in Sirmium with Constantius, to Antioch to attend to the defence of the eastern front.³² This was not without risks: as Constantine's nephew, Gallus had a legitimate claim to imperial power. Gallus was one of two known survivors of the dynastic murders of 337, in which his father Julius Constantius and his step-brother had been killed and his family deprived of some of their wealth in the East. He was also a member of one of the most ambitious senatorial families of Rome: as noted above, Gallus' mother Galla belonged to the traditional Roman senatorial family of the Neratii.³³

It is likely that his relatives, and in particular his uncle Vulcacius Rufinus, had worked towards Gallus' appointment also to strengthen their own position in Constantius'

²⁸ I discuss Constantius' recapture of Rome in [Chapter 7](#).

²⁹ Preparations: *Jul. Or.* 1.40c–d, 42d and Maraval (2013) 111–12. On the importance of Constantius' fleet in his campaigns against Magnentius: Kienast (1966) 145–7.

³⁰ *Lib. Or.* 18.33–6 with Seiler (1998) 87–91.

³¹ Szidat (1981) 90.

³² Sent to defend the East: Constantius' words in his speech to his soldiers in 361: *Amm.* 21.13.11.

³³ Chausson (2007) 124 figure 8 offers a *stemma* of the Neratii; Chastagnol (1968) 73, 135, 155 with *stemma* on p. 296.

government. Rufinus had occupied a central role in Vetranio's government, and was also crucial to his demise: he became the general's main political adviser and negotiated the terms of his surrender to Constantius so successfully that he was retained in post and saw his nephew appointed Caesar in the East.³⁴ Galla's and Rufinus' brother Neratius Cerealis, who had been appointed Rome's first recorded *praefectus annonae* by Constantine early in his career in 328, was also able to profit from the arrangement:³⁵ in late summer 351 he served on the exclusive board of judges that tried bishop Photinus in Sirmium; his fellow judges included Datianus, Thalassius, Flavius Leontius and Taurus, all of whom held key positions in government in the following decade.³⁶ Cerealis, too, was rewarded for his loyal service. He became Constantius' first urban prefect in Rome on 26 September 352, replacing Magnentius' last candidate Mnasea in this post after only seventeen days in office. Thus, while Gallus was a suitable candidate to uphold Constantian rule in the East, this came at a high price: the establishment of a potential rival backed by Constantius' sister Constantina and the powerful Roman family that had been able to marry into the imperial family under Constantine.

In late 351, within only two years, Constantius had thus been able to eliminate one usurper and expand his realm westward to include not only the prefecture of the East but also large parts of the prefecture of Illyricum, that is, the Greek peninsula and the Balkan region. However, his position was still threatened by the presence of Magnentius in the West and the difficulty of receiving substantive political support from Rome. Also, his authority was weakened by the presence in the East of an imperial representative with legitimate claims to imperial power – his Caesar Gallus – as well as through the powerful praetorian prefect Rufinus in Illyricum. The following

³⁴ Hunt (1998) 16 n. 51. Rufinus the Prefect: Migl (1994) 109–18; Vogler (1979) 118–23, 132–5; Néri (1974).

³⁵ *PLRE* I: 197 (Cerealis 2) with Chastagnol (1962) 135–9 no. 58.

³⁶ Trial of Photinus: Hunt (1998) 17–20; Barnes (1993) 109–10; and Brennecke (1984) 91–107; *comites*: *PLRE* I: 243 (Datianus 1), 503 (Leontius 22), 879 (Taurus 3); 886 (Thalassius 1). The court also included *PLRE* I: 546 (Marcellinus 7), *comes Orientis* in 349, discussed in Chapter 3, p. 97.

sections look in detail at the strategies Constantius employed to counteract these threats to his sovereignty: control, persuasion, appeal to his dynastic inheritance and the creation of a substitute imperial senate in Constantinople.

The Eastern Guard

This section examines Constantius' senatorial officials in the East during the reign of Gallus. As will become clear, overall these were no longer drawn from the established senatorial families of Rome but from new senatorial families in the East. When Gallus and Constantina set out for Antioch after the battle of Mursa, they were accompanied by some of Constantius' most trusted officials.³⁷ Given Gallus' imperial pedigree, Constantius ensured that his authority was restricted and his scope of action limited. Unlike the Caesars on the pattern institutionalized by the Tetrarchy, Constantius' Caesar Gallus had no or only limited administrative authority; most significantly, Constantius retained for himself the right to appoint Gallus' key officeholders.³⁸ Ammianus reports that the top personnel in the provincial administration and at the court of Gallus were Constantius' appointees and responsible not to Gallus but to Constantius.³⁹ This pattern was repeated in the military sphere, which had a separate chain of command: the *magister militum* Ursicinus, Ammianus' superior during his

³⁷ For a late sending of Gallus together with officials: Bleckmann (2003b), in his discussion of the *Artemii Passio* (esp. pp. 49–50) and the possibility that Gallus remained at the court of Constantius until after the battle of Mursa because Constantius had initially planned to send him to Gaul to replace Constans. Eutrop. 9.12.1–2 also reports the sending away of Gallus following the battle of Mursa.

³⁸ On Gallus' Caesarship: Maraval (2013) 122–30; Harries (2012) 196–9; Bleckmann (2003b); Barceló (1999); Hunt (1998) 24–5; Matthews (1989) 34–6, 406–8; Vogler (1979) 84–93; Blockley (1972); Thompson (1947) 56–71.

³⁹ Amm. 14.7.1–19. On Ammianus' account of Gallus' rule, see Kelly (2008) 284–93; Barnes (1998) 129–32, (1989b). Upon their appointment in the East, Constantius' officials were repeatedly entrusted with messages for Gallus in an attempt to restrain his imprudent behaviour, e.g. Amm. 14.7.11. On the difficulties these complex lines of responsibilities caused: Potter (2004) 474–83; Matthews (1989) 33–5, 406–9; Vogler (1979) 84–93. On Ammianus and his *History*, see Ross (2016); Kelly (2008); Drijvers and Hunt (1999); Barnes (1998); den Boeft et al. (1992); Matthews (1989); Elliott (1983); Sabbah (1978); Blockley (1972), (1969); Rosen (1970); MacMullen (1964); Thompson (1947).

time as a soldier on the Persian front, as well as Ursicinus' successor, Prosper, were chosen by Constantius.⁴⁰ As Ammianus noted, denying Gallus the right to appoint his own administration allowed Constantius to keep his rival under close supervision. At the same time, it was an effective means of retaining control over the government of the eastern provinces. For, as Ammianus' reports show, these officials connected this part of the empire with the absent Constantius' court, now in Milan, and allowed him to exercise direct control over the government in the East.

The list of relevant officeholders opens with the senatorial officials at court in Antioch. Gallus' *quaestor* was the former proconsul of Asia in 349–51, the Roman senator Caelius Montius. Given his command of Latin and his earlier service in an important administrative post, Montius was well-suited to carry out the important advisory and legal duties of the job. Moreover, Montius, who had been awarded the distinguished title of *patricius*, also had the necessary political authority to check Gallus,⁴¹ he was succeeded by the senator Flavius Leontius, former *comes Orientis* in 349.⁴² As *quaestor* Leontius accompanied Gallus from Antioch to Illyricum, where Gallus was killed in late 354.⁴³ Gallus' *magister officiorum* was Palladius, a native of Antioch who had acquired an intimate knowledge of the imperial chancellery in his time as *notarius* under Constantius.⁴⁴ It seems that Palladius held office in the East from 351 to 354, when he moved to the court of Constantius in Milan; there he remained an influential supporter of the emperor, a fact that would earn him prosecution in Julian's treason trials in Chalcedon in 361, and exile to Britain.⁴⁵ Even Gallus' personal guard answered

⁴⁰ Chain of command: Amm. 14.16. *PLRE I*: 985 (Vrsicinus 2), 751 (Prosper).

⁴¹ *Patricius*: Weiss (1975) 42–4. *PLRE I*: 608 (L. Caelius Montius).

⁴² *PLRE I*: 500 (Leontius 5) = 503 (Leontius 22), and Chapter 3, pp. 96, 98.

⁴³ Amm. 14.11.19–23. Gallus was murdered near modern Pula: Amm. 14.11.20; Soc. 2.34.4; Soz. 4.7.7; the circumstances of Gallus' last days are discussed in Bleckmann (1994) 60–6.

⁴⁴ *PLRE I*: 658 (Palladius 4) with Claus (1980) 176–7 and Olszaniec (2013) Palladius 2. On the notaries under the Constantinian dynasty: Potter (2004) 478–80; Teitler (1985); Kuhoff (1983) 195–205.

⁴⁵ At court: Lib. *Ep.* 440, 450, dated to 355; trial: Amm. 22.3.3.

to Constantius II: Ammianus reports that Gallus' *protector domesticus*, the young Herculanus, reported to the emperor at Valentia in Gaul.⁴⁶ Herculanus' career is in fact highly informative: he was the son of the *magister equitum* Hermogenes who was killed by the Constantinopolitan mob in 341 and could thus claim to be bound to the Constantian cause by loyalty also to his father.⁴⁷ Herculanus' family seems to have settled in Syria, since he became a student of Libanius and owned a house in the Phoenician harbour city of Tyre.

Perhaps the most important post in this constellation was that of the praetorian prefect of the East, who had to align the provincial administration with the court of Gallus. As a result, Constantius chose his candidates carefully. His first nominee was Thalassius, who, though perhaps not of senatorial birth, was, as Libanius' correspondence reveals, a wealthy and influential member of the leading circles in Antioch.⁴⁸ His status had allowed him to advance at Constantius' court at Antioch. In the previous decade Thalassius had served the emperor as *comes* in several secular and religious missions. Over the years he had become a key supporter of Constantius and had accompanied the emperor on his march against Magnentius. Thalassius was among the members of Constantius' court in his camp ahead of the battle of Mursa in 351.⁴⁹ He then returned east with the court of Gallus to supervise the Caesar's administration in Antioch, a city whose ruling elite he knew well from personal and professional experience. In this post Thalassius may have been responsible also for the appointment of Gorgonius, Gallus' chamberlain, whom Libanius considered a friend of the prefect.⁵⁰ When Thalassius died unexpectedly in 353, Constantius was forced to appoint a successor quickly. His choice fell on his *comes sacrarum largitionum*, Domitianus.⁵¹ When Domitianus proved unable

⁴⁶ Amm. 14.10.1; *PLRE* I: 420 (Herculanus 1).

⁴⁷ *PLRE* I: 422 (Hermogenes 2).

⁴⁸ *PLRE* I: 886 (Thalassius 1) with Barnes (1992) 255–6; Bradbury (2004) 268. He was not Phoenician as argued by Pietri (1989) 132.

⁴⁹ Zos. 2.48.5.

⁵⁰ *PLRE* I: 399 (Gorgonius 3).

⁵¹ *PLRE* I: 262 (Domitianus 3) with Barnes (1992) 256; Olszaniec (2013) Domitianus.

to fulfil his duties, a violent confrontation between his men and those of Gallus resulted in his murder alongside that of Gallus' *quaestor* Montius, which greatly jeopardized Constantius' influence over Gallus. Still, the appointment of Domitianus and these other officials reveals that, as Ammianus remarked, Constantius never appointed inexperienced men to high offices (*magister officiorum* or *largitiones* or similar) at court.⁵²

As regards the provincial administration, a notable career is that of the Antiochean Flavius Magnus, proconsul of Asia.⁵³ Magnus arranged for the erection of several honorary statue monuments to the ruling emperor during his time in office, two of which have survived. One was found in Ephesus, the other in the city of Tralles in the province of Caria.⁵⁴ Constantius' imperial titles on the Trallian inscription, which calls him the ruler over all provinces in the West, namely those in Britain, Gaul, Germany, Africa and Illyricum, argue for a *terminus post quem* of late 353, after Magnentius' final defeat on 3 July 353, or possibly also 352, after Constantius' victory over Magnentius in the battle of Mursa.⁵⁵ Two further contemporary documents suggest that Magnus was also, concurrently, *vicarius* of Asiana. A law dated to 354 is addressed to *Magno agenti vicariam praefecturam*;⁵⁶ similarly, a fourth-century verse inscription from Hierapolis in the vicarian province of Phrygia Pacatiana, first published in 1986, is dedicated to a certain Magnus as *vicarius* of Asiana.⁵⁷ Magnus is a common name, so a link between the inscription and the law of 354

⁵² Amm. 21.16.1–3.

⁵³ *PLRE* I: 535 (Magnus 9); Antiochean: implied by Lib. *Ep.* 84, see Malcus (1967) 105–6.

⁵⁴ Ephesus: *AE* 1998, 1023 = *LSA* 2086 (Sokolicek). Tralles: *CIL* III 445 = *ILS* 733.

⁵⁵ Battle of Mursa in 352: Feissel (1998) 95. Gallus' name is erased as a result of his *dammatio memoriae* in 354. On this phenomenon in the fourth century: Delmaire (2003b).

⁵⁶ *CTh* 6.5.8. The date is disputed, since the text of the law as transmitted gives an earlier date, AD 326, the consular year being *Constantino A. VII et Constantio C. cons.*, which suggests Constantine as the lawgiver. The correction to 354 is however accepted by *PLRE* I: 535 (Magnus 9).

⁵⁷ *SEG* XXXVI 1198 = XLVII 1735 with Ritti (2007) and Feissel (1998), esp. 95–6, reading *eparchos* as the trans. of *vicarius* and not of *praeses prouinciae* in such verse dedications.

and with two proconsular inscriptions bearing this name from Ephesus and Tralles must remain tentative, but there is clearly a possibility that we are indeed dealing with the same person. In 1967 Bengt Malcus proposed that Magnus was concurrently proconsul and acting *vicarius* in Asiana in the years 353 and 354;⁵⁸ in that case Magnus would have had administrative oversight over two dioceses. This view received further support in 1998 when Denis Feissel demonstrated that the careers of later proconsuls of Asia exhibit a similar accumulation of offices.⁵⁹ In contrast to the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I*, which argues that Magnus was first proconsul and then *vicarius* (a demotion which is left unexplained),⁶⁰ Malcus and Feissel suggest that Magnus had administrative authority over all the provinces of Asia, probably from the start of his proconsulship in 353, or at latest a few months afterwards. This sequence of events is highly probable, since it also explains how Magnus could later (in 359) become *quaestor* at the court of Constantius, a common promotion for proconsuls of Asia.⁶¹

The accumulation of high offices was rare in the Roman Empire as it gave (too much) power to individual high officials, but it is not without precedent: thirty years earlier Constantine had created such special cumulative administrative posts after his victory over Licinius and the takeover of the East. As discussed in [Chapter 1](#), in 324/5, Lucius Castrius Constans was given oversight over two provinces, Phrygia and Caria.⁶² Around the same time Proculus had been appointed to an important administrative post in two provinces affected by Constantine's eastern campaign, namely the provinces of Europa and Thrace, which were combined for his appointment.⁶³ There is also the appointment of Proculus to an exceptional office in the province of Africa: he seems to have been concurrently proconsul with special jurisdictional

⁵⁸ Malcus (1967) 104–6.

⁵⁹ Feissel (1998) 95–6.

⁶⁰ *PLRE I*: 535 (Magnus 9).

⁶¹ Quaestorship of Magnus: Olszianec (2013) Fl. Magnus; similar career promotion e.g. (*PLRE I*: 608) L. Caelius Montius + (*PLRE I*: 535) Magnus 11.

⁶² *PLRE I*: 219 (Constans 1), discussed in [Chapter 1](#), pp. 22–3.

⁶³ *PLRE I*: 747 (Proculus 7).

powers and acting praetorian prefect of Africa.⁶⁴ Following this pattern Constantius seems to have granted Magnus administrative authority in the proconsular and vicarian provinces in Asia Minor to ensure successful – that is, stable and, above all, loyal – government of these regions. This special authority was a response to the current political context, namely the instability of the eastern administration following the death of his praetorian prefect Domitianus: a letter from Libanius suggests that Magnus was living in Constantinople in 355, from where he travelled to Antioch, probably his hometown. This suggests that, once the danger caused by Gallus was over, Magnus' term of office ended, and with it the accumulation of the two posts in question.⁶⁵

Claudius Strategius Musonianus, not a senator by birth, probably became the first proconsul in Constantinople after the usurpation of Magnentius in 350 (his proconsulship cannot be securely dated, but it is clear that he held it before 352/3).⁶⁶ Musonianus served as *comes* to Constantine and then Constantius II.⁶⁷ Prior to the appointment in 350 Musonianus had assisted Constantius in lower Egypt as *praeses* of Thebais in 349 (still as a *vir perfectissimus*).⁶⁸ It is possible that his mission was connected to the problematic levying of corn for the troops on the Persian front.⁶⁹ His Constantinopolitan post was also a difficult mission: in his Fourth Oration, Themistius alludes to a faction in Constantinople that supported Vetranio or Magnentius; if such a faction existed, Musonianus would have been in charge of restoring Constantius' hold on the

⁶⁴ *CIL* VI 1690 = *ILS* 1240; *CIL* VI 1691 = *ILS* 1241, as discussed in [Chapter 2](#), pp. 76–7.

⁶⁵ The special conditions of Magnus' combined office may offer an explanation for the unusual titlature of three officials who may have been *vicarii* of Asiana in the years following Magnus, Fl. Anysius 3 (*PLRE* I: 80); Att(ius) Philippus 8 (*PLRE* II: 876) and Fl. Simplicius 13 (*PLRE* II: 1016). On these three potential *vicarii*, see Wiewiorowski (2015) 69 n. 138, 70, n. 141.

⁶⁶ Barnes (1987a) 220. Musonianus' praenomen Claudius is attested epigraphically in an inscription from Hierapolis: Ritti (2007) 417.

⁶⁷ *PLRE* I: 611 (Strategius Musonianus).

⁶⁸ Groag (1946) 35.

⁶⁹ That corn from Egypt was used to feed the army in Syria is attested in *Exp. tot. mundi* 28, 36.

city.⁷⁰ In this position Musonianus paid particular attention to the provision of teaching and philosophy in the city, a speech from Himerius suggests. Indeed at the time of his governorship, Constantinople, so Himerius maintains, is the ‘support of Greece, a phrase that Pindar used with reference to Athens’.⁷¹

Probably because he performed well in this post, Musonianus was promoted to a similarly important appointment: the proconsulship of Achaëa. As Constantius’ first proconsul in Achaëa after the capture of Greece around 352/3, Musonianus was thus (again) responsible for overseeing the maintenance of Constantius’ rule in a strategic region.⁷² The vital position of Achaëa in these years is also highlighted by the circumstances of one of Musonianus’ successors in the post, the influential Flavius Hermogenes. A native of Pontus, Hermogenes had begun his career at the court of Licinius, and was then able to re-establish himself as an adviser at the court of Constantine in Constantinople and later of Constantius in Antioch.⁷³ In the early 350s Hermogenes seems to have joined Constantius on his campaigns against Magnentius in the Danubian and Balkan regions, from where he was sent to Greece. It is not entirely clear when he held this post, but the *terminus ante quem* is late 357, as he is recorded in the office of the praetorian prefect of the East from 358 to 360.⁷⁴ His proconsulship is praised in general terms in a speech of Himerius, but an

⁷⁰ Them. *Or.* 4.80 with Brennecke (1984) 87–8.

⁷¹ Him. *Or.* 62.2. On the identity of the governor of Constantinople mentioned in the speech, at Him. *Or.* 62.6, see Penella (2007) 38–9. Barnes (1987a) 220 proposes the speech was delivered in Constantinople and addressed to Musonianus. However, given the title of the speech it is unclear whether it was written for Musonianus or for one of Himerius’ students in Athens who originated from Constantinople: Penella (2007) 39. In view of Himerius’ willingness to compare Constantinople so favourably to Athens (Schlange-Schöningen, 1995, 1–2), the first possibility is perhaps more likely.

⁷² Barnes (1987a) 220.

⁷³ *PLRE* I: 424 (Hermogenes 9) = 423 (Hermogenes 3).

⁷⁴ Schamp (2000) 718–19; Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985) 285; Groag (1946) 36–8 date Hermogenes’ proconsulship to the mid-350s, ahead of his appointment to the praetorian prefecture in 358; Malcus (1967) 147 n. 1, however, dates it to before a possible urban prefecture in Rome in 349, a possibility also noted in *PLRE* I: 245 (Hermogenes 9); Barnes (1987a) 219–20 dates it to the reign of Valens. Moro (1996) 370 argued that Hermogenes the proconsul is not identical with Hermogenes the praetorian prefect.

inscription from Corinth suggests that he played an important role in Constantius' military activities at the time: it records a proconsul of this name under whom the harbour of Corinth was reconstructed following an earthquake, perhaps to facilitate transport for Constantius' campaigns against Magnentius and the assembly of the fleet for the recapture of Africa and Spain.⁷⁵

To return to the proconsulship of Constantinople: around 353 Constantius appointed Anatolius to hold this post. He too was of senatorial rank and had gained experience and prestige as *consularis Syriae* in 349. As has been noted already, Anatolius came from a prominent and very successful family from Berytus – a relative of his had been praetorian prefect of Illyricum in the previous decade.⁷⁶ Drawing on his personal resources, Anatolius himself was later able to advance to the prefecture of Illyricum too, from 357 to 360, having declined the offer of an urban prefecture in Rome in 355.⁷⁷

At this time the vicariate of Pontus, close to Constantinople, was administered by a certain Araxius, who had previously governed the province of Palestine as *consularis*.⁷⁸ As *vicarius* of Pontus Araxius met Julian, who was travelling on behalf of his friends, and the two became companions. In 356 Araxius became proconsul in Constantinople, whereupon he seems to have retired, probably to Antioch. At some point he was able to marry his daughter Vetiana to the Alaman Agilo: in 354 Agilo was still *tribunus stabuli*, but rose to the rank of *tribunus gentilium et scutariorum* before 360, which qualified him for the post of *magister peditum* under Constantius and Julian in the East, which he held from 360 to 362.⁷⁹ It may have been during this eastern appointment of Agilo that he and Araxius

⁷⁵ Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985) 285 no. 23 with pl. IV.1.

⁷⁶ The two Anatolii are discussed also in Chapter 3, pp. 102–3; both are listed as a single person in *PLRE* I: 59 (Anatolius 3), but see Porena (2003) 59; Bradbury (2000); Moro (1996) 370; Migl (1994) 102–7; Néri (1974).

⁷⁷ Offer: *Lib. Ep.* 391, discussed in *PLRE* I: 59 (Anatolius 3).

⁷⁸ See both *PLRE* I: 94 (Araxius) and Bradbury (2004) 230 on Araxius as *vicarius* in Asia in 353/4. However, as Magnus, as argued above (pp. 183–5), was probably *vicarius* in Asiana in 353, Araxius must have been *vicarius* of Pontus.

⁷⁹ *PLRE* I: 28 (Agilo).

agreed to arrange a marriage between their two families. In Syria, Honoratus, an experienced officer and former *consularis* in Syria, acted as *comes Orientis* from at least 353 to 354.⁸⁰

To summarize the discussion so far, it appears that, to ensure stable government, Constantius fell back on a strategy already used by his father: to create larger administrative units in contested regions in order to improve control over them. This is suggested by the accumulation of authority in Asia under Magnus, an arrangement which thus indicates that this was a period of considerable potential political instability. Secondly and more significantly, Constantius appointed several leading senators, yet these were not members of Roman senatorial families but, instead, men with experience in office, and the necessary extended personal networks, in the East. In particular the elites of Antioch were able to capitalize on this opportunity, but so were members of established senatorial families from other eastern cities, including the Anatolii from Berytus. Roman senators, if not already in service in the East at the time of Magnentius' usurpation, no longer served in these eastern posts. It appears, then, that a partition of posts was put in place: during the usurpation of Magnentius and the Caesarship of Gallus, eastern posts were the privilege of men from the East.

What this suggests is that the usurpation of Magnentius had greatly upset the established pattern of appointment of senators in the eastern administration: for the first time since 324, the eastern senatorial offices were no longer occupied by senators from Rome or the West; instead, experienced men with eastern backgrounds now governed the provinces. This cannot be blamed on Gallus, as the appointments remained in the hands of Constantius and his court. The change of policy was therefore a deliberate move. One possibility is that Constantius was unwilling to work with Roman senators. Perhaps more likely, it was impossible for Roman senators to take up office in the East as long as Rome was ruled by Magnentius, when such a move would have been an act of treason.

⁸⁰ *PLRE* I: 438 (Honoratus 2).

Also, given the circumstances, Constantius may have preferred to play it safe and appoint to his administration only men whose landed and personal interests lay in the East, who had nothing to gain but only to lose from the victory of Magnentius. In contrast to Roman senators from established senatorial families in Rome, these relatively new eastern senators did not have the necessary contacts in the West to profit from the survival of Magnentius, while in the East Gallus was not an alternative imperial power, given his inability to grant career advancement. These men thus had much to gain from loyalty to Constantius.

A Senate in Constantinople

The previous section has revealed that, following the usurpation of Magnentius in late 349/early 350, Constantius resorted to a new appointment policy. Keeping a close eye on Gallus and relying on experienced eastern senators were among the strategies Constantius employed to bolster his position in this time of crisis. Another was to found an imperial senate in Constantinople which could serve him as a substitute senate to Rome. The usurpation of Magnentius in 350 barred Constantius from access to Rome and its senatorial aristocracy. This was problematic, since until then Constantius had ruled the East with the support of and in collaboration with the senate of Rome. An epigraphic find from Perge in southern Turkey suggests that, in order to resolve this situation, Constantius founded an imperial senate in Constantinople, in that he used the council there for the first time in Roman history as a source for political support against a western emperor and the senate in Rome. Before it is possible to gauge his motivation for doing so, I shall first discuss in detail the inscription that supports this conclusion.

The inscription belongs to the dossier of honorary statues erected for the praetorian prefect Philippus in several eastern cities in late 351/early 352, after the battle of Mursa.⁸¹ It contains

⁸¹ Feissel (2009) n. 60. Feissel infers this also from the content of the *oratio* preceding the quoted passage. In addition, another inscription from the same statue series was

a copy of an imperial communication from Constantius to the senate of Constantinople, which was attached to the base of the statue to Philippus in Perge. The inscription is fragmentary, but it is clear that it contained an *oratio ad senatum* by Constantius. The full text is still awaiting publication, but for the present discussion Denis Feissel has very kindly given me permission to reproduce here a crucial passage from the Latin inscription, containing about 50 lines of the Latin *oratio* with his provisional restorations. This offers important clues to the status of the senate of Constantinople in the early 350s. For convenience, I quote it in full and offer an English translation:

Ob ha[s igitur] [[causas, patres con]scribti, quae aeternae memoriae mandanda sunt memorabili s[tudio ce]- | [lebrantes tam proba]tam fidem inauratae statuae praemiis muneramur quam cele[berrimis] | [locis illi dedica]ndam constituendamque decernimus uti eius nomen inscribt[um monu]- | [mentis non minus qu]am ipsiu[s for]ma dignationis nostrae gratum fauorem uestr[ique] | [amplissimi coetus] inlustre st[ud]ium perenni commemoratione designet, ut h[ac pri]- | [mum in urbe dignis] uirtutis praemiis donatus merito iudicetur in qua familiae suae fundata[...]| [..... a]dfectu nostri nominis consecrauit. Et quia non minus eius laboribus o[mni]- | [um fere ciuitatum] commodis populisq(ue) prospectum e(st) quam patriae nominis nostri, in sing[ulis ur]- | [bibus]nsui cura obsequioq(ue) rectorum statuas mirabili uiro erigi a[.....] | [placuit, ut huius] effigies omnium semper oculis occurrat cuius deuota officia cunctoru[m] | [semper mentibus] reuolbuntur.

It is hence for these reasons, Conscript Fathers, namely honouring with a memorable marker that which is necessary to be celebrated in eternal memory, we recompense his proven fidelity with the reward of gilded statues, which we order to be dedicated and erected to him in the most prominent locations, so that his name inscribed on the monuments will not least by its representation reveal in eternal commemoration the thankful grace of our esteem and of the illustrious

set up in the joint reign of Constantius and his Caesar Gallus (*CIL* III 214 = *ILS* 738). It is possible to be more precise. There is good reason to date the order of Constantius to erect the statue for his prefect to the immediate aftermath of the battle of Mursa: in another inscription from Ephesus, Constantius described his empire as burgeoning with growth: *imperii mei incrementa reuirescunt* (*AE* 1976, 478, lines 9/10). Such a statement would make sense after the battle of Mursa in the winter of 351/2, when Constantius enlarged his share of the empire in his campaigns against western usurpers and added Illyricum to his realm. These inscriptions are discussed further in the next section.

Crisis and Innovation

attention of your very distinguished assembly, so that it will be judged that he has deserved the worthy rewards of his virtues he received first in the city in which he has consecrated the seat of his family on account of his attachment to our name. And because through his labours he has cared for almost all the cities and people no less than he cared for the home city that carries our name, we rule that in all cities [...] statues are to be erected through the care and attention of the governors to this admirable individual [...] and we order that the images of him whose loyal services are always brought back to the memory of all men present themselves always to everyone's eyes.⁸²

In this letter Constantius thus informed the senators of his wish to erect statues to his praetorian prefect, who is praised for his service and loyalty to the emperor in the city of the addressed assembly as well as in the provinces. It can be inferred that the letter is addressed to the senate in Constantinople and is thus the earliest document of the existence of a senate in this city.⁸³ The status of the assembly in question is revealed by the address employed by the emperor. This is contained in line 2, where there remain traces of a word ending in *-scribti*, which must be restored as *patres conscribti*, the official address of the imperial senate.⁸⁴ However, this *oratio* was not addressed to Rome. The statue series dates to the aftermath of the battle of Mursa in late 351/early 352, so the *oratio* it preserves was composed at a time when Constantius had no authority over Rome or the western provinces. This is also reflected in the documented distribution pattern of Philippus' statues: so far, no example has been found in Rome or any other city in the western half of the empire, while five examples are known from the prefecture of the East. Further, this *oratio* orders that one statue was to be erected in the city where the addressed senate was located. Given the political circumstances of late 351/early 352, this cannot have been Rome or any other city under

⁸² My English trans. is based on a preliminary French trans. by Denis Feissel.

⁸³ Addressed to Constantinople: Feissel (2010) 66 no. 60.

⁸⁴ Municipal councillors could be called *patres* in inscriptions (*CIL* X 1813 = *LSA* 1911, U. Gehn, from Puteoli), or *domini conscripti* (*AE* 1937, 119–20 = *LSA* 1788), but *patres conscripti* or *patres conscribti* is only documented for the senates of Rome and Constantinople: *CTh* 6.4.10 (356), *CTh* 6.4.14 and 15 (AD 359), *CTh* 6.4.25 (AD 384) *Nov. Theod.* 15.1 (AD 439), *CJ* 1.14.8 (AD 446), all sent to Constantinople. See also Reid (1913) 440, and on the address of the senatorial order also Schlinkert (1996) 72.

Magnentius' sway. This possibility is also ruled out by the fact that Philippus is praised in the inscription for having settled himself and his family in the city in question on account of his loyalty to the name of the emperor, *adflectu nostri nominis* (line 8): again, reference must be to a city under Constantius' authority.

This city must be Constantinople. In the letter, Philippus is lauded for his efforts in particular for the city which Constantius calls the 'home city of my name', *patriae nominis nostri* (lines 8–9 of this passage). A similar description of Constantinople can be found in Julian's first oration to Constantius from 355/6, where he refers to Constantinople as a city which was not Constantius' native place, but which acknowledges that it became so through his father's deeds: πατρις μὲν οὐκ εἶναι φησι, γεγονέναι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ σοῦ πατρὸς ὁμολογεῖ.⁸⁵ Technically, Constantinople derived from neither the *nomen* nor the *cognomen* of Constantius but from the *cognomen* of Constantine, as is rightly remarked by Athanasius. In his *Apologia contra Arianos*, he provides a report of his encounter with Constantine in 335: Athanasius' Constantine refers to Constantinople as a city that takes its name from him and one that is his all-blessed home town, τῆς ἐπωνύμου ἡμῶν καὶ πανευδαίμονος πατρίδος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.⁸⁶ The same was observed by the anonymous author of the *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, written in the late 350s, who remarked that Constantine gave Constantinople his cognomen: *Constantinus conditae suum cognomen ciuitati imposuit*.⁸⁷

The description of Constantinople as the city of Constantius ties in nicely with Constantius' policy of using Constantinople for his self-promotion. As with the praetorships of the 340s, the city was no longer the city of Constantine but that of his dynasty. It is revealing that by the time of Julian's first oration in 357 Constantinople was also considered to be named after the

⁸⁵ Jul. Or. 1.5d.

⁸⁶ Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* 86. See also Jul. Or. 1.8b.

⁸⁷ *Exp. tot. mundi* 50. The Latin text is taken from Rougé (1966). Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 41.17 is imprecise when he holds that Constantinople was the city of Constantine's *nomen*.

family of the Constantii: ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ Βοσπόρῳ πόλις, ὅλου τοῦ γένους τοῦ Κωνσταντίων ἐπώνυμος.⁸⁸ Constantius, then, had eclipsed his father and, so the *oratio* found in Perge reveals, could claim that the city was named after him (note also the vague use of *nomen* instead of the more precise *cognomen* in the speech). Together, these points locate the *oratio* firmly in Constantinople.

By this *oratio* Constantius ordered the erection of a gilded statue series (*inauratae statuae*, line 3) for Philippus. More precisely, it concerned the setting up of a statue in Constantinople, and explained that, in order to fulfil its aim of preserving the memory of Philippus' exemplary service (lines 11–12), it was necessary to erect statues also in other cities that profited from Philippus' labours (lines 8–11). Most likely, the *oratio* was part of the dossier accompanying the honorary statue of Philippus, and had been attached to the letter to the provincial governors (*rectorum*, line 10) informing them of their duty to erect a statue to the prefect in the wealthy cities under his authority. This indicates that Constantinople and its senate were being given a leading role in the East. The *oratio* to the new senate was not only of relevance to Constantinople but to the East more generally. What was decided by the senate was valid for the entire eastern prefecture. This implies a primacy of Constantinople among the eastern cities along the same lines as that of Rome in the West.

This *oratio* thus suggests that an institution was created in Constantinople in response to the western usurpations in 350 which served Constantius as a 'senate' in the East against Magnentius and 'his' senate in Rome. When was this policy enacted? The *oratio* must be dated to late 351 or early 352, which provides a *terminus ante quem* for the foundation of the senate. A *terminus post quem* is the death of Constans in 350: prosopographical evidence has shown that until that point Constantius had ruled with the collaboration of the senate of Rome, as attested by the presence of Roman senators in Constantius' eastern administration that was examined in [Chapter 3](#), while

⁸⁸ Jul. Or. 1.5d.

from 350 onwards career records highlight a notable absence of Roman senators in office in the East, as delineated above. This suggests that the usurpation of Magnentius resulted in a break with Rome, and that Constantius turned elsewhere for political support to confront his imperial rival. As shown above, in this situation Constantius fell back on eastern elites to serve him in his senatorial administration. I suggest that, in parallel, Constantius created a substitute senate in Constantinople sometime between mid-350 and mid-351 in order to assemble the senators resident or in office under his authority at the time. If formally regrouped in Constantinople, they could serve as a credible counterweight to Rome. But more precision may be possible on the date of the foundation. In spring 350 Constantius had left Antioch and moved to Constantinople, where he remained to negotiate with both Vetrano and Magnentius until he set out to face Vetrano the following spring.⁸⁹ This sojourn in the city gave him the opportunity to found – at least nominally – a substitute senate in Constantinople, in particular because many of his senatorial supporters will have accompanied the emperor on his move west, including men like Philippus and Montius.

In founding this institution Constantius resolved the problem of ruling without the support of the senate of Rome. As to its duties, the *oratio* from Perge provides additional information. In it, Philippus is praised for having moved his family's domicile to Constantinople. The date of Philippus' move is not specified. Given the political situation in the East and the ongoing military engagements on the eastern front, there is good reason to assume that Philippus' seat of office as praetorian prefect of the East was in Antioch with Constantius rather than in Constantinople, from where it would have been much more difficult to organize the *annona* and the provisions for the eastern campaigns (and to be Constantius' *armiger*, as claimed in the inscription found in Ephesus).⁹⁰ Also, there

⁸⁹ Jul. *Or.* 1.21, 26b–d followed by Maraval (2013) 78, 96; *pace* Zon. 13.7.14 followed by Barnes (2011) 105, 220.

⁹⁰ *AE* 1976, 478.

is no other extant source that records Philippus' residence in Constantinople. He is only securely recorded in the city in 344/5 when the bishop Paul was deposed.⁹¹ Most notably, in Libanius' *Autobiography* there is no reference to Philippus' extended presence in the city or the region more generally. Rather, Libanius always portrays Philippus as a distant figure. He mentions the prefect only in two passages. In the first, his tour of inspection in the province of Bithynia in 348 is briefly alluded to.⁹² In the second, Libanius holds that Philippus was involved in his recall to Constantinople around the same time, yet in the city Libanius has dealings only with the proconsuls until his departure in 353/5.⁹³ The date of the transfer of the residence of Philippus' family to Constantinople can thus not be established beyond doubt, but it appears unlikely that Philippus moved to the city because it was his seat of office.

Was the move related to Philippus' inclusion in the new senate? This required citizenship (and nominal residency) in Constantinople.⁹⁴ Constantius' letter, however, contains an important hint. The emperor's emphasis on the fact that Philippus' move to Constantinople was motivated by his great affection for Constantius' cause is noteworthy and suggestive: Philippus had become a citizen of Constantinople because he supported Constantius' cause. What this suggests is, I propose, that Philippus had become a citizen of Constantinople in 350 in order to join its new imperial senate. Philippus was not the only senatorial member of Constantius' administration to be enrolled in the new institution at that point. That this was probably expected of all senators in Constantius' retinue is suggested by later evidence which reveals that the new senate was soon composed of wealthy men from all over the eastern provinces rather than just Constantinople.⁹⁵ It is thus

⁹¹ Soc. 2.16; Soz. 3.10 with Isele (2010), 46–7, 57–60; Barnes (1993) 86; Dagron (1974) 431.

⁹² Lib. *Or.* 1. 69–70.

⁹³ Lib. *Or.* 1. 74.

⁹⁴ This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, pp. 248–9.

⁹⁵ *Demegoria Constantii* and *CTh* 6.4.8–10, analysed in Chapter 6, pp. 216–17, 234–7, 247–54. See also Moser (2016b).

likely that, alongside Philippus, Constantius' key supporters, including Datianus, Helpidius, Flavius Leontius, Marcellinus, and the praetorian prefects Thalassius and Domitianus, were (re)registered in Constantinople in this period.⁹⁶

If so, this new senate, composed of the senators resident in the domain of Constantius, could then approve his policies against Magnentius and declare the latter an unlawful emperor. Indeed, this may have been the very reason for its creation: to bolster Constantius' campaign against the western usurpers with the support of the important political legitimation conferred by his senators, the 'senate' in Constantinople. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know whether he created out of the senators in his retinue an entirely new institution for the senators of the East more broadly, or whether he upgraded the existing urban council of Constantinople to senatorial rank. The latter is perhaps more likely, given the tradition of later speakers of claiming a continuity between the council founded by Constantine and the senate under Constantius.⁹⁷ Also, we do not hear again from the *curiales* of Constantinople. All the same, due to the absence of reliable evidence, this question cannot be resolved definitively.

In sum, this section has argued that the founding of the imperial senate in Constantinople was prompted by Constantius' need for political support and loyalty; it was created as a response to the usurpation of Magnentius. Why in Constantinople? As discussed earlier, in the previous decade the city had become a symbol of the Constantinian heritage and therefore of Constantius' imperial legitimacy, in particular in the conflict with the West. It was thus ideally suited to be the site of Constantius' eastern imperial senate during the civil wars with the western emperors backed by Rome.

⁹⁶ *PLRE* I: 243 (Datianus 1); 413 (Helpidius 2) = 414 (Helpidius 4) =? 416 (Helpidius 11), 503 (Leontius 22), 546 (Marcellinus 7), 886 (Thalassius 1), 262 (Domitianus 3).

⁹⁷ Continuity: Them. *Or.* 3.48a, Lib. *Or.* 42.23.

Statues of Loyalty

Thus Constantius created a substitute senate in Constantinople in late 350, as a response to the usurpation of Magnentius. The senate was the product of a severe political crisis. This is powerfully revealed by the very context in which Constantius' *oratio* to this institution was found: the series of honorary statues erected to Constantius' praetorian prefect Flavius Philippus. On the emperor's orders Philippus was awarded several golden statues in Constantinople and other major eastern cities for his loyal services to the imperial cause.⁹⁸ Several examples of such statue monuments, notably the inscribed bases or slabs of stone that accompanied these statues, can be documented in the epigraphic and literary record, and together they provide valuable information about both the career of the honorand and the political situation in the East during the usurpation of Magnentius and the creation of a substitute senate in Constantinople. As well as the statue monument from Perge treated above, three further statue bases have been found, from Ephesus, Alexandria Troas and Cyprus, which can also be compared to reports about Philippus in the literary and legal literature.

A large inscription, today broken into two fragments, was found in the 1950s by Austrian archaeologists during their excavations in Ephesus. It contains an imperial order to an official called Marinus to set up gilded statues to a virtuous and self-sacrificing praetorian prefect and close friend of the emperor, Philippus.⁹⁹ This inscription, carefully chiselled onto a slab of grey-bluish marble and bordered by a carved aedicular frame, was part of an honorary statue monument. In their excellent reinterpretation of the text, in 1962, Louis Swift and James Oliver rightly concluded that the emperor must be Constantius II, Philippus his praetorian prefect of the East and Marinus the proconsul of Asia. According to the emperor, he had these statues set up to repay Philippus for his

⁹⁸ *PLRE* I: 696 (Philippus 7); *AE* 1976, 478 lines 30–3 with Swift and Oliver (1962).

⁹⁹ *IK* Ephesos 41 (1979) = *AE* 1967, 478; *PLRE* I: 560 (Marinus 1).

great and illustrious merits, and to praise his model character, impeccable behaviour and administrative abilities. Philippus is presented as the emperor's father and friend, *parens et amicus* (line 8), never without concern for the emperor; Philippus was not only Constantius' comrade-in-arms, he seemed to be the very general who guaranteed his felicity.¹⁰⁰ Virtuous and self-sacrificing, Philippus was a model official both to praise and to emulate – and so his statues should serve as constant reminders of his labours and his devotion to the Roman state.¹⁰¹ A fragmentary version of Constantius' letter to Marinus was seen by Cyriacus of Ancona in Alexandria Troas on his travels in Asia Minor in the early fifteenth century; it was rediscussed by Filippo Di Benedetto in 1998. The text is identical to the one from Ephesus, but the name of the addressee was lost, so it remains unclear whether it is a copy of the letter to Marinus or an identical letter addressed to a lower official in Alexandria Troas.¹⁰²

A shorter summary inscription, found in Chytri in Cyprus, a province in the diocese of Oriens, also records the erection of a gilded statue to Philippus.¹⁰³ Its text is much shorter than the above-mentioned inscriptions, citing only the bare details necessary to understand the purpose of the statue: the fact that Philippus was awarded this extraordinary honour of gilded statues due to his virtuous devotion and self-sacrifice.¹⁰⁴ Finally, there is the fourth statue monument, found in Perge and discussed in the last section. It bore at least two inscriptions: a short one giving the name of the honorand and the awarder, and a longer one with the imperial letter and *oratio* discussed

¹⁰⁰ *IK Ephesos* 41 (1979) = *AE* 1976, 478 lines 15–17: *numquam exper(s) sollicitudinibus mea, numquam arduis rebus alienus, his gestorum prospere quasi quidam armiger, immo dux nostrae felicitatis apparuit.*

¹⁰¹ *IK Ephesos* 41 (1979) = *AE* 1976, 478 lines 33–7: [*qui p*]opulorum omnium diuersarumque nation(um) ore celebratus, singulorum quoque oculis incurrat sitque eius in re publica [nost]ra memoria sempiterna, qui laboribus suis rei publicae nostrae semper gloriam iuuit. On *merita* gradually becoming an important factor in imperial praise: Migl (1994) 238; Löhken (1982), esp. 135–47.

¹⁰² Di Benedetto (1998).

¹⁰³ *CIL* III 214 = *ILS* 738.

¹⁰⁴ Gilded: Ephesus: *statuas inauratas* (*IK Ephesos* 41 (1979) = *AE* 1976, 478 line 32), Cyprus: *statuam ex aere fusam auro decoratam* (*CIL* III 214 = *ILS* 738 lines 9–10).

above, divided into two plates, which perhaps flanked the smaller inscription and Philippus' statue at the centre of the arrangement.¹⁰⁵

The two texts from Perge are each highly revealing. The short inscription, which explains that Flavius Philippus, *clarissimus* prefect, was honoured by the council of the dazzling metropolis of the Pergeans as a benefactor and *corrector* in every respect, reveals that once Constantius' order had reached the provincial governors (as is implied by the inscription from Ephesus), some had delegated to wealthy cities of their realm the task of erecting the statue as commanded by Constantius.¹⁰⁶ The long inscription, as discussed earlier, offers important additional insights into the institutional context of the order: it was issued to the new imperial senate in Constantinople, which was to pass a vote granting a statue to Philippus that was to lead off a series of statues in the cities of the East. In this letter Constantinople emerges not only as the seat of an imperial senate but also as the capital of the East, a model to be emulated by other eastern cities.

It is commonly argued that these statues were posthumous honours to rehabilitate a deceased prefect. Constantius is believed to have removed Philippus from his office as praetorian prefect due to the latter's disloyal behaviour during a diplomatic mission. This view rests largely on Athanasius. Athanasius, well-known for his opposition to Constantius in the Arian controversy, reports that one year after the death of the deposed bishop Paul, Philippus lost his powerful position and became the laughing stock of some of his contemporaries, and that he died far from his fatherland:

οὐδὲ γὰρ παρήλθεν ἐνιαυτός, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ἀτιμίας καθιρέθη τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ Φίλιππος, οὕτως ὡς ἰδιώτην γενόμενον, ὑφ' ὧν οὐκ ἤθελε καταπαίζεσθαι. πάνυ γοῦν καὶ αὐτὸς λυπούμενος ... καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν προσδοκῶν τὸν ἀναροῦντα ἕξ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδος καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τῶν ἰδίων ὥσπερ ἐκλαγείς, ἐπεὶ μὴ οὕτως ἤθελεν ἀπέθανε.

¹⁰⁵ Short inscription: Sahin (2015) 177 no. 1; long inscription: Feissel (2007).

¹⁰⁶ Φλ(άουιον) Φίλιππον τὸν λαμπρ(ότατον) ἔπαρχον, τὸν τῶν ὄλων εὐεργέτην καὶ τῶν ὄλων διορθωτὴν ἢ βουλή τῆς Περγαίων λαμπρᾶς μητροπ[ό]λεως. The Greek text is taken from Sahin (2015) 177 no. 1.

Ruler of Rome and Constantinople (AD 350–361)

For, before a year had passed, Philip was deprived of his position with great dishonour and so, having become a private citizen, he was ridiculed by people that he did not want mocking him. And so he was distressed and, ... separated from his homeland and his family, expecting every day that someone would finish him off; and so, just as though he had been struck, since he did not want it to happen like this, he died.¹⁰⁷

Based on this report, the authors of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I* proposed that these statues were a posthumous rehabilitation of the disgraced prefect, whom Constantius had first removed and then rehabilitated.¹⁰⁸ This became a circular argument for the public disgrace of Philippus in 351, with a later, more elaborate, version claiming that Philippus had fallen out of favour with Constantius, who believed rumours about his disloyal behaviour during his diplomatic mission.¹⁰⁹

However, it is possible to arrive at another interpretation of Athanasius' account of the fall and death of Philippus. To begin with, his report must be handled with care because of Philippus' involvement in the persecution of the supporters of bishop Paul of Constantinople (in 342/3) who, like Athanasius, was a defender of the Nicene faith.¹¹⁰ Also, in this passage Athanasius merely points out that Philippus lost his authority in a dishonourable manner: Athanasius' precise words are μετὰ πολλῆς ἀτιμίας καθηρέθη τῆς ἀρχῆς, but there are no details and so also no reference to an official disgrace.¹¹¹ Athanasius does not even imply the involvement of Constantius. Timothy Barnes has proposed that Athanasius' enigmatic words could also cover a scenario in which Philippus' honour was blemished not by Constantius, but by Magnentius, in that the usurper did not honour the prefect's rights as ambassador, but took him prisoner.¹¹²

¹⁰⁷ Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 7 (trans. Flower).

¹⁰⁸ *PLRE I*: 696 (Philippus 7); Jones (1955). Taken up in e.g. Maraval (2013) 190.

¹⁰⁹ Disgrace: e.g. Pietri (1989) 131; De Jonge (1982) 252–3; *AE* 1973, 525.

¹¹⁰ The events of 342/3 are described in the *Martyrium SS. Marciani et Martyrii*, see Martindale (1980) 490 Flavius Philippus 7.

¹¹¹ Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 7 with Barnes (1992).

¹¹² Barnes (1992).

This is likely also in view of other evidence of Philippus' career and mission. Other historians indicate that Constantius transferred Phillipus from the East to his court in Sirmium and entrusted him with a diplomatic mission of the highest priority. Philippus retained his title as prefect, but was sent as an ambassador to Magnentius in late summer 351, before the battle of Mursa. Zosimus' *New History*, written at the turn of the sixth century but drawing heavily on Eunapius' near-contemporary account of these events, describes Philippus' mission in detail. Philippus is said to have negotiated with Magnentius a possible division of the empire between him and Constantius and to have given a powerful speech in front of Magnentius' assembled troops in which he almost persuaded them to surrender to Constantius.¹¹³ A similar narrative is provided by Zonaras, who, however, does not mention Philippus by name, but claims that the embassy was in fact able to win over Magnentius' successful general Silvanus shortly before the major clash between Constantius and Magnentius in battle.¹¹⁴ Philippus was not allowed to return to Constantius immediately after his mission: Zosimus repeatedly notes that Magnentius violated the rights of ambassadors and retained Philippus in his camp, and that Magnentius later made use of Philippus' name to secure the crossing of the River Save for his troops. He declared that this strategic move was not against the orders of Constantius, claiming that Philippus had affirmed this to him.¹¹⁵

However, neither in Athanasius nor in these other sources is Philippus said to have died in the camp of Magnentius. Athanasius states that Philippus lost his powerful position a year after the death of Paul, but he does not state more precisely when he died, reporting only that he died far away from his family and his fatherland. Philippus' death is thus constructed as a parallel to the enforced exile of bishop Paul, in that the

¹¹³ Zos. 2.46.2–3, 48.2–5, 49.2 with Harries (2012) 223 and Bleckmann (1999a) 75–6.

¹¹⁴ Zon. 13.8.5, compared to Zosimus' account in Bleckmann (1999a) 76–96. Silvanus' defection is also mentioned in Amm. 15.5.33; Jul. *Or.* 3.97c; Aur. *Vict. Caes.* 42.15.

¹¹⁵ On the different versions of the battle of Mursa and Philippus' mission, see the excellent discussion by Bleckmann (1999a).

‘exiled’ Philippus also lived in constant fear of death and died in a foreign land. It is implied that Philippus did not return to the East but died in the West, but his death need not have occurred in 351/2. Nor do the epigraphic sources from late 351 give any indication of the death of Philippus or his rehabilitation. First, the inscriptions provide no clear indication that these statues are posthumous. In his letter from Ephesus, Constantius uses the present tense in some passages. Some scholars have used this to argue that Philippus was therefore still alive when the letters were composed.¹¹⁶ Yet, Constantius also repeatedly uses the historical perfect. The description of Philippus’ deeds in the *oratio* from Perge are equally vague, so it is impossible to arrive at a precise date for Philippus’ deeds as praetorian prefect or, more importantly, for his death. Second, there is no reference to an official restoration as would be characteristic of such public rehabilitations.¹¹⁷ Rather, the emperor explains that all this exemplary behaviour by Philippus might have provoked denigration of the prefect: ‘And therefore if anyone envied him because of his right actions, someone who nevertheless up to now could not be discovered, he did not dare to show the poison of his character against the advantage of our state.’¹¹⁸

Indeed, further evidence reveals that the prevailing reconstructions of Philippus’ career, which assume his death in 351, need to be revised. This evidence implies that Philippus was alive until at least the spring of 354. First, an inscription recording building works on the theatre of Hierapolis in the province of Phrygia Pacatiana, which, so the inscription explains, began in 350 and were concluded in 352 (dated by the first joint consulate of Constantius II and Gallus), names Philippus as the praetorian prefect under whose authority the *praeses* Flavius Antonius Julianus supervised the works.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ *IK Ephesos* 41 (1979) = *AE* 1976, 478, lines 9–11, 27–9 with Wankel (1979) 258.

¹¹⁷ The statue erected in Rome in 431 at the rehabilitation of Nicomachus Flavianus under Valentinian III and Theodosius II (*ILS* 2948) is discussed by Hendrick (2000).

¹¹⁸ *IK Ephesos* 41 (1979) = *AE* 1976, 478, lines 35–6 (trans. after Swift and Oliver 1962).

¹¹⁹ Ritti (2007) 415–17.

This implies that Julianus still considered Philippus to be his superior as praetorian prefect in 352. It thus appears that Thalassius did not formally take up office as Gallus' praetorian prefect in 351 but only in the course of 352, after the erection of the building inscription in Hierapolis.¹²⁰

Second, a law preserved in the Theodosian Code, *CTh* 8.7.2, records a *praefectus praetorio Philippus* in Arles. The consular date of this law is problematic: it gives the names of an Augustus Constantine who was consul for the seventh time, and a Constantius Caesar. Several dates and emendations have been proposed, but in view of the fact that Constantius II is securely known to have spent the winter of 353/4 in Arles, where he assumed his seventh consulship on 1 January 354, I follow Otto Seeck in dating this law to 3 November 353.¹²¹ Leaving aside for a moment the question of the identity of the addressee, the content of the law, which deals with the wrongful acquisition of high rank with the help of members of the administration, also aligns well with the political context at Arles in late 353/early 354. At that time Constantius was dealing with the aftermath of the usurpation of Magnentius, which included the trial of (supposed) supporters of the usurper.¹²² In order to establish his hold on Gaul, the emperor set out to reorder the Gallic administration and army. The current ruling, reversing Magnentius' policies as regards advancement and privileges, fits well into this context. Indeed, several laws regarding the (honorary) titles of *ex protectores* and other ranks in 353/4 reveal that this was an important issue at the time. Probably concurrently with the ruling issued to Philippus, Constantius also sent a letter (today *CTh* 8.7.3) to Silvanus, his *comes* and *magister militum* in Gaul (following Silvanus' defection from Magnentius on account of the mission of Philippus).¹²³ To this should be added *CTh* 8.7.4–6, issued between 14 May

¹²⁰ Note also that Thalassius is not confirmed in Antioch prior to 352/3, as attested by a letter of Libanius (*Ep.* 16), and *CTh* 16.8.7 of 3 July 353.

¹²¹ Seeck (1919) 38, 199. Constantius II in Arles in the winter of 353/4: Amm. 14.5, 14.10.

¹²² Amm. 14.5.

¹²³ *PLRE* I: 840 (Silvanus 2) with a discussion also of the date of the law.

and 6 October 354 to the praetorian prefects (Vulcacius Rufinus in Gaul, Maecilius Hilarianus in Italy and Rufius Volusianus in Illyricum), which deals with similar matters regarding privileges and exemptions.¹²⁴ Besides the agreement in place and date, Seeck's dating is attractive also because it necessitates only a minor emendation in the consular dating, namely to delete an N in the name of the Augustus to arrive at *CONSTANTIO* instead of *CONSTANTINO*. It seems, then, that Philippus was still alive and praetorian prefect (in Gaul, Italy or Illyricum) in late 353 or early 354.¹²⁵ If this is correct, Philippus' career can be reconstructed as follows: following six years in office in the praetorian prefecture of the East from 344 to 350, he was transferred to the imperial court in Sirmium in 351, when he was employed as ambassador to the camp of Magnentius. Philippus did not die on this mission but remained at the court of Constantius until at least late 353, perhaps as praetorian prefect of Illyricum, when he assisted Constantius as praetorian prefect of Gaul following the defeat of Magnentius in the summer of 353 and the deposition of Magnentius' praetorian prefect in Gaul.¹²⁶ His death may have occurred in late 353 or sometime in 354, perhaps in the treason trials of Magnentius' supporters, having been accused of disloyal behaviour during his mission to Magnentius.¹²⁷

Bruno Bleckmann has attractively suggested that Philippus suffered disgrace during the mission at the camp of Magnentius because of his own behaviour, but that he was only held accountable for it following Magnentius' defeat.¹²⁸ Perhaps

¹²⁴ *PLRE* I: 782 (Rufinus 25), 433 (Hilarianus 5) and 978 (Volusianus 5). Note also *CTh* 7.21.1 of 352 (date from Project Volterra) to Rufinus, then praetorian prefect of Illyricum, on similar matters regarding *ex protectores* after the general Vetricio was deposed.

¹²⁵ This is also proposed by Palanque (1969) 603–5, who, however, places Philippus in Illyricum, followed by Vogler (1979) 129. Philippus may then have replaced Vulcacius Rufinus, who travelled with Constantius' court. Rufinus at court: Vogler (1979) 137–8.

¹²⁶ Possibly Nunechius: *PLRE* I: 635 (Nunechius).

¹²⁷ The colourful description by Ammianus of the treason trials (and of the prominent role of 'Paul the Chain' in it), including confiscations of property and exiles (Amm. 14.5.), suggests that Constantius was conscious of the importance of a clear break with the establishment of Magnentius.

¹²⁸ Bleckmann (1999a) 82 n. 142. Disgrace in 353, see also *AE* 1967, 478.

Philippus had made the mistake of advising his emperor against a military confrontation with the well-equipped usurper: in 357 Julian alludes to several advisers of Constantius who sought to persuade him against a war with Magnentius and to acknowledge him as a co-ruler, as does Themistius.¹²⁹ If so, Athanasius' report was not mistaken: Philippus died a pitiful death for treason in 353/4, far away from his family and in constant fear of his imminent death.

In turn, these new findings about the career of Philippus – that he probably did not die at the hands of Magnentius – call for a reconsideration of the statue series and its political context. As has been established, in the immediate aftermath of the battle of Mursa, perhaps within weeks of the appointment of Gallus and his dispatch to Antioch, Constantius ordered the erection of a series of honorary statues to his prefect Philippus in all wealthy cities of his empire. At the time Philippus, so the inscription from Hierapolis suggests, was still the praetorian prefect in the dioceses of Asiana, if not the entire East, until Thalassius took over his duties there in the course of 352. When Constantius ordered the statue series to be erected, the statues were not honours to a deceased praetorian prefect, but praised the current praetorian prefect Philippus. Such a series of honorary statues was unprecedented, and must hence have been the result of exceptional circumstances.

Why this statue series? A fifth statue mentioned by John Lydus in his *On the Magistratures* is revealing in this context. In this passage, John describes the statue of a praetorian prefect Philippus erected in Chalcedon.¹³⁰ In a recent edition of the text published in 2006, Jacques Schamp suggests that this is a statue of Flavius Philippus under Constantius, an identification that was also proposed by Timothy Barnes and Denis Feissel.¹³¹ What is interesting is that John Lydus refers to this statue to show that praetorian prefects have (had) military duties originally, and that this is revealed by the fact that

¹²⁹ Jul. *Or.* 1.41d; Them. *Or.* 4.62b; see also Amm. 21.16.15. For the date of Themistius' oration, see Leppin and Portmann (1998) 80–3.

¹³⁰ John. Lyd. *De Mag.* 2.9.6–7.

¹³¹ Schamp (2006) dccxxvi–dccxxxviii; Feissel (2007) 150; Barnes (1987b) 17.

Philippus is represented wearing a military belt with a sword attached to it, a *Ξιφος* or *sica* to the Romans. This suggests that, unlike most of the non-imperial late antique statues that survive of civilian governors, Philippus' statue was probably not a togate statue, for John's point is precisely that Philippus was not represented in *habitu civili*, but that his statue showed him in his military garb.

First, these statues reminded Constantius' appointees of their duty to be loyal to their absent emperor. To issue such a comprehensive series of public monuments was a clear statement of power, authority and superiority by Constantius. Despite his own absence, so this series suggested, Constantius was still firmly in control. Secondly, the statues of Philippus were to proclaim the loyalty of the prefect and the importance and rewards of loyal service to Constantius more generally. Philippus, so the emperor explains, should be an example for others to emulate. His statues should remind Constantius' appointees and other subjects in the cities in the East whom they served and the rewards he could bring. These statues of Philippus in military garb also underlined the military victoriousness of Constantius and his supporters in times of increased imperial fragility. The statues are a response to the threat posed by Magnentius in the West, yet they are aimed also at Gallus and his supporters in Antioch. That the five recorded statues of Philippus were located in the prefecture of the East also suggest that the Caesar's nominal authority was restricted to this part of the empire, while Illyricum was directly responsible to Constantius: so far, no examples of the statue series have been found outside the provinces of the prefecture of the East, suggesting that it was restricted to these provinces.

Because of the challenging political circumstances, Constantius did not content himself with the erection of one or two gilded statues to honour his praiseworthy servants, as might be expected, but erected a unique series of honorary statues in the cities of the eastern provinces. It is also perhaps not by chance that Constantius' order to erect gilded statues to his loyal prefect Philippus in military garb coincided suspiciously with the appointment of Gallus as Caesar and his dispatch to

Antioch: the implication is that loyalty to Constantius was due not only against Magnentius but also against Gallus, in whose nominal realm the statues were set up.

The statues also gave substance to the foundation of the senate in Constantinople. This city was, so the letter indicates, the first city to receive a statue for Philippus, one of the first senators of the new institution. By this, the city and its senate were marked out as the model that other cities now had to follow in erecting their own statue to the prefect. Constantinople was also made the capital of the East, which was the appropriate status for a city that hosted Constantius' imperial senate in the East in an imperial crisis in which the memory of Constantine was again used to support Constantius against (potential) imperial rivals. That Constantinople emerged as a centre of pro-Constantian feeling in this period is also suggested by the conspiracy around the praetorian prefect Domitianus against Gallus in 353/4. Following the prefect's murder, one of the conspirators, Apollinaris, *cura palatii* of Gallus, son-in-law of Domitianus, and son of the elder Apollinaris, the *consularis Phoenices* in 353/4, fled to Constantinople but was brought back, exiled for treason and killed together with his father on their estate near Antioch.¹³²

Defender of the Constantinian Heritage

This final section returns to the question of Constantius' use of the memory of his father Constantine. It was deployed to shore up Constantius' aggressive stance against Magnentius: Constantius claimed that he was forced to defend the Constantinian heritage against a barbarian. In this context Constantinople was again used as a basis to advertise Constantius' dutifulness towards father and empire.¹³³

I begin with Constantius' use of the dynastic motif in his confrontation with Magnentius. Notably, Themistius' second

¹³² Amm. 14.7.19–20, 14.9.8; *PLRE* I: 83 (Apollinaris 1), the father, 83 (Apollinaris 2), the son.

¹³³ On Constantius' civil war rhetoric, see also Omissi (2018).

oration, written two years earlier in late 355, introduces Magnentius as a crazy felon who brought great disorder to the empire by irrationally disregarding the principle of dynastic rule.¹³⁴ However, so Themistius explains, Constantius not only defeated this Typhon, but fought down several others, great and small, old, mature and young, which sprang up everywhere in the empire.¹³⁵ One he had defeated by words (Silvanus), one by the sword (Magnentius?) and one without him even noticing it (Silvanus or Nepotianus).¹³⁶

Finally, their treatment after they were deposed is contrasted with Constantius' political manoeuvres after the death of Constantine: Themistius' description of the defeats of Vetricano, Nepotianus, Silvanus and Magnentius is framed by references to the other crucial moments in the reign of Constantius II: the dynastic murders in 337, and the joint rule with his brothers, brought to an end with Constans' death in 350. The dynastic murders of 337, so Themistius explains, had been signs of Constantius' rightful love of order: after the death of Constantine, he had taken over an empire that was in great unrest and troubled by 'unordered movements', so he set out to convert this unruliness to order.¹³⁷ In turn, the rightful defeat of the usurpers had allowed Constantius to establish himself as the single ruler over the Roman Empire: in 337, so Themistius concludes, Constantius had been content with only a share of the paternal empire, not because he was weak, but because anything else would have necessitated war against his relatives (the murders of his uncles and cousins are passed over in this passage).¹³⁸ Now, however, he has become the sole heir to Constantine's inheritance.¹³⁹ Together, Themistius implies, the defeat of these

¹³⁴ Them. *Or.* 2.33d–34a, with commentary in Leppin and Portmann (1998) 59 n. 48. On the character of Magnentius, see also Jul. *Or.* 1.33c–34b, 35c, *Or.* 2.58c–d.

¹³⁵ Them. *Or.* 2.34a–b.

¹³⁶ My trans. is adapted from the German trans. of Leppin and Portmann (1998). For the identity of the usurpers, see comments in Leppin and Portmann (1998) 59 nn. 51–4. On Vetricano's age, see also Them. *Or.* 4.56b. On the revolt of Silvanus, see *Amm.* 16.5.15–64; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 42.14–16; Jul. *Or.* 1.48c, 2.98c–101b.

¹³⁷ Them. *Or.* 2.33d. My trans. is adapted from the German trans. of Leppin and Portmann (1998).

¹³⁸ For Constantius as a moderate co-ruler with his brothers, see Jul. *Or.* 1.41b–c.

¹³⁹ Them. *Or.* 2.38c–39a.

usurpers had made Constantius the sole ruler he always should have been since the death of Constantine, and had, once and for all, clarified who was to rule the empire and its elites.

Julian's two panegyrics (*Or.* 1 and 3) on Constantius are also of interest in this context. Written in 355 and 357, they are contemporary with those of Themistius and also deal with Constantius' victories against Vetranio and Magnentius.¹⁴⁰ Importantly, Julian sees the familial, dynastic element as crucial. As Bruno Bleckmann has shown, they raise the issue of the fraternal duty to avenge the murder of Constans. By contrast, Magnentius is scolded for not honouring the *pietas* that bound him to the family of Constantine, to whom he owed his entire career. There is also the issue of dynastic exclusivity: Magnentius was not a rightful ruler because he did not have Constantinian blood.¹⁴¹ (In view of the dynastic murders in 337 and the recent murder of Gallus, some contemporaries may have wondered whether he would have survived even if he had.) Additional information on Constantius' policy to present his campaigns against Vetranio and Magnentius as rightful dynastic policies comes from Athanasius' *Historia Arianorum*, written in 357/8. In sections 49–50, the bishop reports that Constantius deposed Vetranio with the argument that only a brother could be the rightful heir to his brother's inheritance. This is crucial, for it suggests that the dynastic argument was also used in the East to justify the war against Magnentius, even though this aspect was not so pronounced in Themistius' orations examined above. In Athanasius, Constantius is reported to have asked Vetranio 'to whom does the inheritance belong after a brother's death?' Interestingly, Athanasius (for once) agrees with Constantius: in this endeavour, the emperor is 'seeking to obtain his just rights'.¹⁴² In a later passage Constantius is criticized (amongst other things) for neglecting

¹⁴⁰ Date of Jul. *Or.* 1: Tantillo (1997) 36–40; Straub (1964) 177.

¹⁴¹ Bleckmann (1999a) 55–7. The same message of legitimacy was conveyed by the *HOC SIGNO VICTOR ERIS* coinage minted around the time of the battle of Mursa, see Maraval (2013) 106 n. 3, 99, 223.

¹⁴² Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 50.1 (trans. Flower). Athanasius is very keen on the idea of dynastic obligations and reflects Constantius' use of this concept in his official communication: Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 49–51. His removal from his bishopric in Alexandria for

Constans' legacy (by removing the author from his bishopric in Alexandria) while at the same time pretending to build a mausoleum for his brother.¹⁴³ Zosimus in turn reports that in his speech in front of Vetrano's troops Constantius had reminded his audience of Constantine's generosity to his soldiers and explained that he was about to set out west against the murderer of one of Constantine's sons, again implying a dynastic argument on the side of Constantius.¹⁴⁴ Nothing is known about the mausoleum of Constans, which was perhaps erected in Milan, but the fact that it is taken up by Athanasius suggests that it was part of Constantius' display of his fraternal – or rather dynastic – piety following the defeat of Magnentius, as a way to justify the civil war.¹⁴⁵

Constantius' use of Constantinople is more complex. As discussed above, in this period and in order to shore up his claim against the ruler of Rome Magnentius, Constantius founded a second senate in Constantinople. Now the city could function as a symbol not only of his own Constantinian heritage, but also of the Constantinian heritage of the entire empire and its political stability. Themistius' fourth oration, written to congratulate Constantius on an important victory on behalf of the senate of Constantinople in the mid-350s, is highly illuminating in this context. In the speech Themistius describes in great detail how the city of Constantinople had been greatly concerned about the two usurpations in the West, that of Vetrano and Magnentius, 'when the situation in the empire was very difficult and there was much anxiety about the future'.¹⁴⁶ Constantinople is described as a restless city deeply shaken by terror and great fear, whose anxieties were only soothed by the arrival of their great (μέγας) emperor

instance is termed a breach of Constantius' promise to (the memory of) Constans, whom Constantius is quoted as having called his 'brother of divine and pious memory' for whom he had so much affection that he 'put up with the return of that man [Athanasius] to Alexandria (Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 49.2, trans. Flower).

¹⁴³ Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 69. In this section, Constantius' behaviour towards his family is painted in the blackest terms, see also Humphries (1997) 456.

¹⁴⁴ Zosimus, 2.44.3.

¹⁴⁵ On the mausoleum of Constans, see the forthcoming article by Meaghan McEvoy.

¹⁴⁶ Themistius, *Or.* 4.56a. My trans. is adapted from that of Leppin and Portmann (1998).

(Constantius), after he had reordered the East (an allusion perhaps to the conclusion of the military campaign against Shapur in 350). Themistius' portrayal of Constantinople's fears in this period is colourful – the city's hands were shaking and she changed colour in her fear – as is his description of their prompt resolution by Constantius: it was only when he sent her the second usurper Vetricius, as a prisoner of war following a most beautiful victory by words and by weapons, that Constantinople regained hope and confidence.¹⁴⁷ In this description Constantinople is again used as an emblem of Constantius' empire: Constantinople's fears are the fears of his empire during the usurpations in the West. Therefore it is particularly important that Themistius notes that the city was again cast into terror at the news that the murderer and criminal (Magnentius) was opposing Constantius and threatening Constantinople with pillage, enslavement and expulsions; it was only after the battle of Mursa, when 'it was clear that everything had turned against the usurper', that she gained relief from her worries.¹⁴⁸ Nothing, Themistius affirms, underlining the seriousness of the situation, could have proved more clearly Constantinople's (and the empire's) devotion to Constantius in these circumstances than these anxieties.¹⁴⁹

Altogether, then, the Constantinian heritage became an important motif in Constantius' campaign against Magnentius. As will be revealed in the following two chapters, this justified both the establishment of a second senate in Constantinople as a product of Constantine's plans for the city ([Chapter 6](#)), and the claim that Constantius surpassed his father in his love of Rome and its senate ([Chapter 7](#)).

Conclusion

The discussion of Constantius' policies in response to the usurpations in the West has called into question the common

¹⁴⁷ Them. *Or.* 4.36b.

¹⁴⁸ Them. *Or.* 4.56c–d.

¹⁴⁹ Them. *Or.* 4.56d.

assumption that the usurpation of Magnentius was not a major threat to Constantius' position. Magnentius cut Constantius off from Rome. Even though the former's hold was contested there (as the quick changeover of urban prefects after the battle of Mursa suggests), it was sufficient to make it impossible for Constantius to rule with the official support of the Roman senate; this was because of the fact that the senate of Rome had been re-established as an important pillar of political support for emperors in the East since Constantine's defeat of Licinius in 324. In this situation, Constantius took a great gamble: he ventured west to wage war against western emperors while upholding his position in the East in a complex arrangement that involved his cousin Gallus (whom he sent to Antioch as his nominal representative while controlling him by appointing his administration) as well as a second senate in Constantinople.

The examination above of the measures set in place by Constantius in response to Magnentius and, subsequently, Vetranio began with a study of Constantius' senatorial appointees in Gallus' administration. This revealed the absence of established Roman senators, who were no longer appointed to office in the East. Instead, Constantius' administration for Gallus was staffed with experienced eastern senators of high social standing (many were already of senatorial rank at the time of their appointment, or were from among the highest echelons of the eastern elite) and wealth. This exclusion of Roman senators from officeholding in the East was accompanied by the creation of a second senate in Constantinople, as is highlighted by an inscription from Perge. It contains an imperial letter to the Conscript Fathers, *patres conscripti*, of Constantinople, revealing that a senate had been created there by early 352 at the latest, and probably in 350 during Constantius' passage in Constantinople, I suggest.

In this senate Constantius assembled the senators in his part of the empire in order to legitimize his position and policies against Magnentius. Men like his praetorian prefect Philippus moved their families to Constantinople and became citizens there in order to join the new institution. This

institution was necessary not only because of the presence of Magnentius in Rome but also because of the threat posed by Gallus. Constantius retained control over Gallus' administration, but this arrangement was fragile. As a result, after the battle of Mursa had revealed Magnentius to be a serious enemy, Constantius set out to secure the loyalty of the East and affirm his authority there through a series of honorary statues to his praetorian prefect Philippus. These statue monuments were intended to serve as constant reminders of the rewards of loyal service and of his authority in the East despite his absence. Similarly, the establishment of a senate in Constantinople reinforced Constantius' claim that his campaign against the western usurpers was prompted by the need to preserve the Constantinian heritage. The examination of several contemporary panegyrics revealed that dynastic considerations were brought into play in defence of Constantius' decision to wage civil war, a claim that was substantiated by the fact that his policy, too, was supported by a senate.

Altogether, the usurpation of Magnentius thoroughly transformed the Roman Empire once Constantius refused to accept the usurper as his co-ruler. From this contest, Constantius emerged as sole ruler, but in order to defeat the usurper he had set the course for the separation of the empire into two administrative realms each headed by an imperial senate, one in Rome and one in Constantinople. Magnentius' usurpation, then, had ushered in the end of Constantine's reunited empire.

ROMANIZING CONSTANTINOPOLE

The Creation of a Second Senate

On 11 December 359, thirty-five years after its foundation in 324, Constantius gave Constantinople its first urban prefect, Honoratus.¹ Honoratus' jurisdiction covered not only Constantinople but also nine neighbouring provinces: he was authorized to judge cases from Europa, Rhodope and Haemimontus as well as the six provinces of Asia Minor closest to Constantinople, namely Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Hellespontus, Lydia, the Isles and Phrygia Salutaris.² From now on Constantinople's chief official would be on a par with the praetorian prefects and, notably, the urban prefect of Rome, whose authorities he mirrored.³ The appointment of Honoratus concluded the process of establishing a second senate in Constantinople. This chapter offers a revised account of this development. My purpose here is to identify the administrative and political moves that Constantius made after 350 to promote this senate to a full equivalent to Rome.

Gilbert Dagron, who has made the most detailed study of Constantinople and the promotion of its status at this time, has rightly termed this period the 'rattrapage institutionnel' of Constantinople, highlighting the various efforts that were necessary for Constantinople to catch up with Rome as a

¹ *CTh* 1.6.1 (361) with Jones (1964) 1: 132; Vanderspoel (1995) 67; *contra*: Dagron (1974) 215–17, 226 for an earlier date, 11 September 359.

² *CTh* 1.6.1 with Errington (2006) 153–4, 162–8; Dagron (1974) 226–94; on the prefect's role in the building works in Constantinople: Bauer (1996) 267–8; on Themistius' own experiences as prefect of Constantinople in 384 (*Them. Or.* 17, 34): Heather and Moncur (2001) 285–98. It is not clear whether there were curatorships on the Roman model in Constantinople, but see *CTh* 6.4.11.

³ *CTh* 11.20.27 (357), 1.6.1 (361).

The Creation of a Second Senate

fully fledged institutional capital of the East.⁴ In my discussion three key measures are analysed in detail. The first section examines the institutionalization of a separate *cursus honorum* of senatorial posts in the East. I show that Constantius did not use the reunification of the empire in 353 to reinstate the empire-wide *cursus honorum* (the hierarchy of senatorial posts in the provincial administration) attached to Rome. Instead he merged the eastern posts into a separate eastern *cursus* attached to Constantinople. I then consider the creation of a senatorial class from among the eastern provincial elite. This was effected by imperially driven recruitment in the East as well as by the transfer from Rome to Constantinople of senators with residency in the East, as discussed in the second section of the chapter, ‘Expansion and Division of the Senatorial Order’. In order to arrive at a fully fledged imperial senate in Constantinople, Constantius introduced complex regulations concerning adherence to the senate and the praetorship, the traditional entry point to the senate, which became tantamount to a tax on membership in the senate, as examined in the third section, ‘Praetorships’. The following section of the chapter draws on these studies to review the new but traditional senatorial aristocracy that emerged. Throughout this process Rome was the reference model for the new capital of the East. The question of the relationship between the two cities is crucial. It is often argued that Constantinople was a *new* Rome, in that its institutions were regulated in ways that were better adapted to late antique rulership, and that, therefore, its senate and senatorial aristocracy differed in many aspects from that of Rome.⁵ Against this view, the fifth section of the chapter, ‘A Second Roman Senate in Constantinople’, investigates the character of the new senate and highlights the similarities between the two institutions in traditions and language.

The emergence of a new senate in the East was closely interlinked with the promotion of Constantinople as a city. This I examine in the penultimate section, ‘Urban Investments’,

⁴ Dagron (1974), citation at 143.

⁵ I discuss these narratives in detail on pp. 1–9 above (introduction).

where I discuss how the city's urban, religious and educational infrastructure was intensively developed in this period. The final section of the chapter, 'Legitimizing Revolution', examines how Constantius sought to legitimize his revolutionary policy of establishing a new senate in the East. In sum, this chapter delineates Constantius' efforts to 'romanize' Constantinople, that is, to make the city and its senate a full equivalent of Rome.

The Emergence of an Eastern *Cursus Honorum*

In September 355 Constantius sent a Latin *oratio* to the senators of Constantinople, the *Demegoria Constantii*.⁶ In this letter the emperor informed the senators that he had included Themistius in the senate and now formally asked them for their (nominal) consent by co-optation.⁷ This document is traditionally regarded as the first reliable evidence for the establishment of an imperial senate in Constantinople, one that assembled men of senatorial rank. The letter is addressed to the *σύνοδος τῶν λαμπρότατων πατέρων*, to the assembly of *clarissimi* fathers in Constantinople, who were also addressed as *ὅ πατέρες συγγεγραμμένοι*, Conscript Fathers (the traditional address of the Roman senate).⁸ Only men who were born with clarissimate rank or had received it from the emperor were allowed to apply.⁹ However, this letter is not the earliest surviving document to refer to a second imperial senate in Constantinople. As

⁶ The *Demegoria Constantii*, a formal imperial communication (*oratio*) to the senate, was written in Latin, see Lib *Ep.* 434. It is discussed in Heather and Moncur (2001) 97–114 and Dagron (1968) 60–5. Heather and Moncur (2001) 100 n. 162 investigate its authenticity. The question of the identity of the author (Themistius or, more likely, Constantius) does not affect the historical value of the document as a source for the public image of Constantius: whether or not these were his own words, it is clear that this is how he wanted to be seen by his subjects in Constantinople.

⁷ On adlections in the later Roman Empire: Garbarino (1988) 1–72, 282–335 and also Näf (1995) 17, Chastagnol (1992) 256–8, 264–9; Kuhoff (1983) 39–42; Löhken (1982) 122, 130–2; Jones (1964) I: 541. On the role of the senate, note that in Them. *Or.* 26.326, the act of granting Themistius senatorial rank in the council is ascribed to the senate.

⁸ *Dem. Const.* 19b, 18c, 20b. On the address, see also my discussion of the *oratio* found in Perge in Chapter 5, pp. 190–2.

⁹ *Dem. Const.* 22b: λαμπρότατον ἕμιν δέδωκα μονογενῆ φιλόσοφον.

discussed in detail in [Chapter 5](#), a still unpublished inscription from Perge in southern Turkey contains the copy of an earlier *oratio* of Constantius to this senate, confirming that this institution existed by late 351/early 352 at the latest.¹⁰ The evidence suggests that this senate assembled the senatorial supporters of Constantius in his fight against Magnentius, senators who had previously been registered in Rome, including his praetorian prefect Philippus.

A key feature of the foundation of a second senate in Constantinople is the emergence of a separate *cursus honorum* in the East. As was revealed in [Chapter 5](#), in the early 350s senatorial posts in the eastern administration, including the prefecture of Illyricum, became the privilege of senators of eastern origin. Roman senators, that is senators who came from western provinces, were confined to the posts in the western administration (under Magnentius). The study of Constantius' provincial governors reveals that this separation remained in place after 353.

The most visible change occurred in the proconsulship of Achaëa. Roman senators did not regain access to this prestigious post, which had been reintroduced three decades earlier by Constantine.¹¹ Instead, probably following Strategius Musonianus (the proconsul of Achaëa in the early 350s, as suggested in [Chapter 5](#)), the next known proconsul is Musonius, who was probably an Athenian.¹² Thereafter, in 356 Musonius became *magister officiorum* at the court of Constantius in Milan. On his retirement in 358, when Himerius addressed a speech to him, Musonius settled in Thessalonica.¹³ Another known proconsul of Achaëa in this period is Flavius Hermogenes, a native of Pontus, whom I discuss in [Chapter 5](#). The list of proconsuls of Achaëa under Constantius – at least as far as they are known to us – closes with Publius Ampelius.¹⁴

¹⁰ [Chapter 5](#), pp. 189–96.

¹¹ See [Chapter 1](#), pp. 20–8, continued under Constantius: pp. 91–113, 180–9.

¹² *PLRE I*: 612 (Musonius 1) with Bradbury (2004) 258; Penella (2007) 207; Claus (1980) 171–2; Malcus (1967) 147. *Contra*: Olszaniec (2013) 285 argues that Musonius was born in Thessalonica. Strategius: *PLRE I*: 611 (Musonianus) and pp. 185–6 above.

¹³ *Him. Or.* 39.14–15 (winter 360/61).

¹⁴ *PLRE I*: 56 (Ampelius 3); Olszaniec (2013) Publius Ampelius. Hermogenes: pp. 186–7 above.

Ampelius, who was from Antioch, is attested in this office in 359/60.¹⁵ Before this post, he had served Constantius in Milan as *magister officiorum* prior to Musonius, sometime between 355 and 358.¹⁶ In a panegyric to Ampelius as proconsul, Himerius applauds his unusually substantial building activities in the province.¹⁷ Epigraphic evidence from Sparta shows his involvement in building works at the theatre, and indicates that Ampelius was to make sure that the commission of *curiales* elected to procure the works fulfilled its duties.¹⁸ Another inscription in Chalcis attests a similar procedure for the supervision of *βουλευται* responsible for organizing and financing reconstruction works, in this case the exedra of a stoa.¹⁹ One measure of Ampelius' success as proconsul was the desire of the provincials to erect a statue in his honour, as is recorded in Aegina, where an individual erected a statue of him next to that of the Muses.²⁰

This absence of Roman senators is found also in other eastern posts previously occupied by them. Only one proconsul of Asia is documented after Flavius Magnus in 352/3–354.²¹ This is Julianus, in office in Asia Minor in 360. He had previously been *consularis Phoenices* and was hence most probably an eastern senator.²² The provenance of Justinus, proconsul of Constantinople in 355, is unknown, but his successor in 356 was Araxius, previously in office in Palestine.²³ Further, all of Constantius' praetorian prefects of the East in this period

¹⁵ Penella (2007) 208 with further refs.

¹⁶ 358: *PLRE* I: 56 (Ampelius 3); Groag (1946) 43 and Olszaniec (2013) Publius Ampelius. Arguing for 355–6: Lewin (2001) 639; Barnes (1987a) 215–16; Kuhoff (1983) 182; Clauss (1980) 139, 145; Weiss (1975) 62; Chastagnol (1962) 185. See discussion in Olszaniec (2013) 40.

¹⁷ *Him. Or.* 31.

¹⁸ *SEG* 11 464; *SEG* 15 218, see Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985) nos. 24 + 25.

¹⁹ *IG* XII 9.907. See Sironen (2001), (1994); Frantz (1988). Ampelius' inscriptions are helpful also for discerning the patterns of financing public works in this period, see Lewin (2001).

²⁰ *IG* IV 53.

²¹ See Chapter 3, pp. 183–5.

²² *PLRE* I: 470 (Iulianus 11).

²³ *PLRE* I: 489 (Iustinus 2), 94 (Araxius).

The Creation of a Second Senate

were easterners, including Musonianus, Hermogenes and Helpidius.²⁴

More important than the eastern provenance of the new officeholders is the fact that they did not also take up office in the West, as their predecessors had done before 350, but advanced on a separate hierarchy of posts restricted to the East. In this hierarchy, experience remained a prerequisite for higher office. Provincial governors were appointed to vicariates, proconsulships or as *comes Orientis* (Appendix D). Thus, Araxius, appointed *consularis* in Palestine, became *vicarius* in Pontus in 353 and was then promoted to the proconsulship in Constantinople in 356.²⁵ The former *consularis Syriae* (in 349) Anatolius the Younger became proconsul in Constantinople in c. 353,²⁶ and Julianus, *consularis Phoenices*, was appointed to the proconsulship of Asia in 360.²⁷ The Phrygian Dulcitus, a notary and *comes* of Constantius, rose to the post of *consularis Phoenices* and *vicarius* or *consularis* of Thrace, and then became proconsul of Asia under Julian from early 361 to 363.²⁸ Finally, two proconsuls of Achaëa became praetorian prefect of the East.²⁹ The highest honours were, in descending order, the consulship, the urban prefecture and the proconsulship.³⁰ Senators who progressed on this career ladder could be appointed to high-ranking offices at court, producing ‘mixed’ careers in the provincial and the higher court administration.³¹

²⁴ *PLRE* I: 611 (Strategius Musonianus), 423 (Hermogenes 3), 414 (Helpidius 4).

²⁵ *PLRE* I: 94 (Araxius). *Vicarius* of Pontus: as argued p. 187 above.

²⁶ Bradbury (2000).

²⁷ *PLRE* I: 470 (Julianus 11).

²⁸ *PLRE* I: 274 (Dulcitus 5) with Malcus (1967) 107–8. I do not agree with Malcus that Dulcitus was also *consularis Aemiliae* in 356: it is much more plausible that this official should be identified with the Dulcitus (*PLRE* I: 274 Dulcitus 6) who was *consularis Siciliae* between 340 and 350 (Malcus (1967) 108 n. 4).

²⁹ *PLRE* I: 611 (Strategius Musonianus), 423 (Hermogenes 3) = 424 (Hermogenes 9).

³⁰ *CTh* 6.4.12 (361). The quaestorship and the suffect consulate, offices held by senators of traditional families in Rome at the start of their career (see Chapter 1, pp. 37–9), cannot be documented in Constantinople. I return to this point on pp. 240–1 below.

³¹ On the development of the *cursus honorum* in this period, see e.g. Heather (1998) 191–7 with further refs and Stein (1968) 121–2.

The careers of these new eastern senatorial officeholders were therefore restricted to the East, with one notable exception: eastern senators were appointed to the court of Constantius in the West and to the key palatine and provincial posts around Julian, Constantius' Caesar in Gaul from late 355 onwards: the *comes Orientis* of 354, Honoratus, became Julian's first prefect of Gaul, and Nebridius, *comes Orientis* from 354 to 357, moved on to become Julian's *quaestor* until in 360 he was promoted to the prefecture in Gaul.³² Further, two *comites* of Constantius, Flavius Florentius and Flavius Taurus, became praetorian prefects, Florentius first in Gaul (357–60) and then in Illyricum (360–1), and Taurus in Italy and Africa (350–61).³³ These arrangements were thus similar to those regarding Gallus: Constantius sent Julian to Gaul but reserved for himself the right to appoint his officials. However, such careers were not common but resulted, as in the case of Gallus, from the special situation of Julian's Caesarship in Gaul. Nebridius' successor in the office of the *comes Orientis*, Domitius Modestus, who occupied this post from 358 to 362, for instance pursued a more traditional career: he rose to the position of prefect of Constantinople in 362, before being appointed to the eastern prefecture in 369, an office he held until 377.³⁴

The evidence for senatorial officeholders in the eastern administration after 353 thus reveals that the reunification of the empire had not led to a reintegration of the traditional senatorial *cursus honorum* established by Constantine. Instead, a separate hierarchy of senatorial posts in the East was put in place, without, however, disrupting the traditional hierarchy of posts: the sequence of officeholding still ran from a provincial governorship to the post of *vicarius* or proconsul and thereafter (for the fortunate few) to a prefectureship. This was no small thing. From 324 until 350 there had been one hierarchical system uniting the senatorial posts within the

³² *PLRE* I: 438 (Honoratus 2), 619 (Nebridius 1).

³³ *PLRE* I: 365 (Florentius 10), 879 (Flavius Taurus 3). On these western appointments, see [Chapter 7](#), p. 286.

³⁴ *PLRE* I: 605 (Modestus 2).

provincial administration of all prefectures in the empire, stretching from Africa and Italy to Syria. During the usurpation of Magnentius, Constantius ceased appointing men from the traditional senatorial families of Rome or other western senators to senatorial posts in the East.³⁵ Like his father, Constantius might have used the defeat of his imperial rival to reunify the senatorial *cursus honorum*. That he instead effectively detached the senatorial posts in the eastern administration from Rome, to form a separate *cursus honorum* which encompassed the posts in the eastern administration, is thus an indication of a new policy: to establish a second senatorial system in the East based on Constantinople.

Expansion and Division of the Senatorial Order

Around 357 Constantius forcefully expanded the new eastern senatorial order. Themistius reports that the aim was to arrive at a body of 2,000 members registered in Constantinople; this number will not have been achieved under Constantius but had perhaps been reached by the time of Themistius' speech in 385.³⁶ Generally, there were two ways to acquire senatorial rank, which was the prerequisite for co-optation into the senate: either through birth (hereditary senatorial rank), or through the grant of clarissimate rank by the emperor.³⁷ Men of curial rank had two options to enter the senate.³⁸ First, they could obtain a special imperial waiver.³⁹ If the application to the senate was successful, the candidate acquired senatorial rank concurrently with admission to the senate; if rejected, the applicant retained his curial rank. Such a grant was obtained

³⁵ I discussed this development in detail in [Chapter 5, pp. 171–89](#).

³⁶ *Them. Or.* 34. 13 with Jones (1964) 2: 527. *Contra*: Chastagnol (1992) 261–2, (1976) 350, who argues that the quota was reached under Constantius.

³⁷ As is stated by the emperors in 383, Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius: *si quis senatorium consecutus nostra largitate fastigium uel generis felicitate sortitus*, *CTh* 6.2.13. On the heredity of senatorial rank, see Schlinkert (1996) 85–94 with refs.

³⁸ Admission of senators: the topic has also been treated by Chastagnol (1992) 256–91; Garbarino (1988); Dagrón (1974) 154–63; Jones (1964) 2: 530–2; Petit (1957) 361–6. They have at times reached conclusions different from the ones presented here.

³⁹ These were not codicils of clarissimate rank: Jones (1964) 53; *contra*: Garbarino (1988) 245–6 who elaborates the case made in Petit (1957) 361–6.

for instance by Thalassius, a rich *curialis* from Antioch who applied for entry to the senate in 388.⁴⁰ The candidate then had to prove that he qualified for the rank of senator (a process called *dokimasia*); for this, he had to find a senator to speak in his favour (*iurator, petitor, precator*) as well as several witnesses (*testes*), who had to pledge that he possessed the relevant qualities.⁴¹ After his successful admission to the senate, he would then be obliged to serve as praetor.⁴² Other candidates could receive even stronger imperial support. Whenever the emperor wished someone of non-senatorial status to be admitted to the senate, he granted an *adlection*, the emperor himself serving as the candidate's *iurator* and *testis*, as Constantius did for Themistius in 355.⁴³ There were two possibilities, the *adlectio inter praetorios* and the *adlectio inter consulares*; both exempted the adlected senator from the duty of holding a praetorship, yet only the *adlectio inter consulares* granted the rank of a provincial governor (*consularis*).⁴⁴

The second route to admission was to acquire membership of the senatorial order through appointment to the (low-ranking) senatorial post of *consularis*. Prior to appointment the candidate probably had to prove that he had the means to satisfy the fiscal liabilities of senators and to make a declaration of his means, *sollemnem professionem edere*, with the *censuales* in Rome or Constantinople, to be assessed for tax purposes.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Lib. *Or.* 42. 6–10, 33–5, 45–8; see also *Ep.* 923–37, 939, 943. On Thalassius' family background and the nature of his case: Errington (2006) 158–9; Norman (2000) 145–8; Chastagnol (1992) 280–1; Garbarino (1988) 244–6; Dagron (1974) 156–7; Petit (1957) 361–6. See also the case of *PLRE* I: 193 (Celsus 3) with Bradbury (2004) 236–8; Chastagnol (1992) 284; Petit (1957) 355–60. In Thalassius' case Libanius calls the letter *grammata*, in Celsus' case *deltios* (Lib. *Ep.* 88), see also Garbarino (1988) 377.

⁴¹ One such supporting speech has survived, that delivered by Symmachus in the senate at Rome: *Symm. Or.* 7; on *testes*: Chastagnol (1992) 140–1.

⁴² Libanius asks Themistius to ensure the expense (*ἀνάλωσις*) incurred by Celsus is moderate in Lib. *Ep.* 86. This expense is the praetorship not the senatorial tax (*folllis*) (see Cabouret, 2000, 81), which Libanius elsewhere explicitly refers to as 'a tax in gold' (Lib. *Ep.* 40).

⁴³ Dagron (1974) 161 n. 4.

⁴⁴ These procedures were also known in Rome, see Garbarino (1988) 1–72, 282–335 and also Näf (1995) 17.

⁴⁵ *CTh* 6.4.7 (AD 354) with Jones (1964) 2: 537 with reference to *CTh* 6.2.13 (AD 383). *Contra*: Chastagnol (1992) 288–9, who argued that *CTh* 6.2.13, where this procedure is recorded, refers to an *adlection inter consulares*.

The Creation of a Second Senate

This procedure is documented in particular for *consulares* (governors), but other passages from the same law and an earlier ruling of Constantius to the urban prefect of Rome in 354 suggest that ordinary senators, too, were obliged to make a tax declaration of their complete landed wealth.⁴⁶ This declaration allowed assessment of their fiscal contributions (the *foliis* tax and the praetorships).⁴⁷ Of course, the existence of such laws reveals that in practice this demand was often circumvented.

Several such new governor-recruits can be documented. The young senator Julianus, for instance, gained senatorial rank between his equestrian governorship in Phrygia and Libanius' intervention concerning the amount of his *foliis* tax in winter 358/9, which appears to have been linked to his appointment as *consularis* in Euphratensis.⁴⁸ There is also the young Priscianus, who managed to get into the senate in connection with his appointment to the post of *consularis* of Euphratensis in 360/61.⁴⁹ Finally, when the Antiochean *curialis* Thalassius was rejected in 388, Libanius advised him to apply for a post in the administration instead.⁵⁰ Such attempts did not always bear fruit: a certain Hyperechius repeatedly tried to gain high office in order to enter the senate and escape his curial duties in Ancyra, where he belonged to one of the wealthiest families. Despite the support of Libanius, he remained unsuccessful.⁵¹

Ambition was fuelled by the creation of new senatorial opportunities. From 357 onwards, the emperor systematically upgraded formerly equestrian imperial posts throughout the East to senatorial rank ([Appendix E](#)).⁵² For example, when Fl. Quintilius Eros Monaxius was appointed *praeses* of

⁴⁶ *CTh* 6.2.13 (383) and *CTh* 6.4.7 (354).

⁴⁷ On senatorial fiscal obligations in Constantinople, see Moser (2016b), 438–45 with refs.

⁴⁸ *PLRE* I: 17 (Julianus 14) with Bradbury (2004) 252.

⁴⁹ *PLRE* I: 727 (Priscianus 1) with Bradbury (2004) 261–2.

⁵⁰ *Lib. Or.* 42. 54; Dagron (1974) 157. Chastagnol (1992) 288 noted that the post in question could also be an equestrian post, which, as discussed (Chapter 2, pp. 54–6), also exempted the officeholder from curial burdens.

⁵¹ *PLRE* I: 449 (Hyperechius) with Bradbury (2004) 249–50; Foss (1990) 43–4. Mitchell (1993) 87–8 offers a detailed discussion of his family background and career. On the mobile curial elites of Ancyra, see also Mitchell (1993a) 84–91; Foss (1990).

⁵² For a comprehensive discussion of the restructuring of the lower administration in the late 360s, see Kuhoff (1983) 79–110.

the province of Caria in the 350s, this was still an equestrian post: on a building inscription his title is given as ὁ διασημότατος ἡγεμῶν.⁵³ In 361/3 his successor Antonius Tatianus was of senatorial rank: he is ὁ λαμπρότατος ἡγεμῶν.⁵⁴ A certain Fl. Nemesius Olympius, the *vir clarissimus* who set up a statue to Constantius in Myra, was the (senatorial) *praeses* of Lycia.⁵⁵ The first securely dated senatorial *consularis* in the province of Thrace appears in 360,⁵⁶ in Hellespontus in c. 355, in Bithynia in 355/6,⁵⁷ in Cilicia in 362⁵⁸ and in Macedonia around 356.⁵⁹ The experienced Bassidius Lauricius, *comes* and *praeses* of the province of Isauria in 359, was also a *vir clarissimus*.⁶⁰ To this list, it is necessary to add several provinces in Syria that also became senatorial in the late 350s, as Libanius' correspondence reveals. These are the provinces of Euphratensis (senatorial in 360 or 361 at the latest),⁶¹ and the province of Palestina,

⁵³ Roueché (1989) no. 19. *PLRE* I: 608 (Monaxius).

⁵⁴ Roueché (1989) no. 20 with pl. vii.

⁵⁵ *PLRE* I: 647 (Olympius 16) with *CIL* III 12126 = *LSA* 632, *CIL* III 12127 = *LSA* 634. For the identification of him as the senatorial governor of Lycia, see e.g. Feissel and Wörrle (2015) 280 with further literature.

⁵⁶ *PLRE* I: 602 (Miccalus) in 360: Malcus (1967) 108 n. 3. There is the possibility that Dulcitus, proconsul of Asia in 361 (*PLRE* I: 274 Dulcitus 5), was *consularis* and not *vicarius* in Thrace in 359, see Malcus (1967) 108. If so, he (and not Miccalus) would be the first documented *consularis* of Thrace.

⁵⁷ Hellespontus: *PLRE* I: 308 (Eusebius 40). The governor of Bithynia in 355/6 was the senator *PLRE* I: 308 (Eusebius 40), brother of Eusebia, Constantius' wife since the early 350s, and of *PLRE* I: 448 (Hypatius 4), with whom he shared the consulship in 359. Eusebius' successor in Bithynia *PLRE* I: 174 (Calliopius) with Bradbury (2004) 236 was a wealthy *curialis* of Antioch, his successor *PLRE* I: 469 (Iulianus 8) was also from Antioch.

⁵⁸ Its governor *PLRE* I: 193 (Celsus 3) had been summoned to take up his seat in the senate in 359 (see above). His post in Cilicia in 362 must therefore have been a senatorial one.

⁵⁹ *PLRE* I: 643 (Olympius 3).

⁶⁰ *PLRE* I: 479 (Bassidius Lauricius). In this post, which he held until 362, he was entrusted with suppressing the Isaurian insurrections, see Kantiréa (2013) 117; on the insurrections, see Delmaire (2003a); Isaac (1998) 452–3; Lee (1998) 218; Matthews (1989) 355–67. Bassidius was an accomplished governor: between 354 and 357 he had been *consularis* of the province of Cyprus, and responsible there for the restoration of a building destroyed by fire, under the supervision of Strategius Musonianus, see Cayla (1997) 71–6. He was then appointed to the post of *praeses* of Armenia (Kantiréa, 2013, 117), where he probably also had important military duties, experiences which will have served him well in his Isaurian post.

⁶¹ The then governor *PLRE* I: 727 (Priscianus 1) had tried to join the senate in 359 by appointment to a senatorial post: *Lib. Ep.* 61, *Lib. Ep.* 62, *Lib. Ep.* 127 with Bradbury (2004) 261. His successor *PLRE* I: 471 (Iulianus 14) in 361 had

which was divided into two provinces around 357, *Palestina Prima* and *Palestina Salutaris*, probably both governed by men of senatorial rank. There is also the case of Cyprus: the first senatorial *consularis*, a certain Quirinus, a native of Antioch, held office there between 351 and 354.⁶² Having begun his career under Flavius Philippus, he had previously held the posts of *praeses* of Lycia and governor (*praeses* or *consularis*) of Pamphylia. His successors in office included the already mentioned Bassidius Lauricius (between 354 and 357), and Flavius Faus[t-] between 360 and 363.⁶³ In Egypt the first senatorial governor of the province of Augustamnica, which was still an equestrian post in 352, is recorded on 2 July 357.⁶⁴

In this system personal networks were key to social advancement. While proconsuls and vicars were appointed by the emperor,⁶⁵ nominations to simple provincial governorships (and related posts) were generally made by the praetorian prefects, who headed the provincial administration.⁶⁶ Libanius' letters illuminate the prominent role the two praetorian prefects Strategius Musonianus and Anatolius played in the career of many of his friends and students.⁶⁷ Key to social advancement was thus access to appropriate networks of power and patronage: many of Libanius' protégés secured a post in the administration after successful petitions to high-ranking officials at the imperial court or to the praetorian prefects. To name two students who were able to profit from

been nominated senator in 359, so the post had become a senatorial one by 361 at the latest.

⁶² *PLRE* I: 761 (Quirinus). On the upgrading of the governorship to senatorial rank in the mid-350s, see Kantiréa (2013) 118.

⁶³ On Flavius Faus[t-], see Kantiréa (2013).

⁶⁴ *PLRE* I: 601 (Metrodorus 2) with Palme (1998) esp. 134–5. The last equestrian *praeses* in Oxyrhynchus was Fl. Areianus Alypius, who is recorded in office in 351 and 352, see *P. Oxy.* 60. 4091.9.

⁶⁵ In Rome, the candidates for the proconsulships were allotted in the senate, Delmaire (2013) 139 with further refs, who rightly points out that this use of the lot to assign administrative posts cannot be documented in Constantinople (however, it is used for the election of praetors, see my discussion on pp. 243–4 below). At any rate, all officials were formally appointed by the emperor.

⁶⁶ Delmaire (2013) 140. Provincial governorships were annual offices, iteration was prohibited: Delmaire (2013) 137.

⁶⁷ See the letters of Libanius to/about Anatolius collected by Bradbury (2004) 227–9, and to Musonianus at Bradbury (2004) 257–8.

Libanius' contacts at court, Sabinus was made *consularis* of Syria in 358 thanks to the prefect of Illyricum, Anatolius,⁶⁸ who also appointed Aristaenetus, a native of Bithynia, as *vicarius Pietatis* (the province of Pontus was renamed *Pietas* in honour of Constantius' wife Eusebia)⁶⁹ in early 358; Aristaenetus was killed shortly thereafter in the earthquake in Nicomedia in August 358.⁷⁰

The recruitment of *curiales* into the senatorial order meant enlarging the ranks of the new senate, but it greatly disadvantaged the municipal councils. They had to cope with the loss of the new senators' financial contributions. In order to spare the municipal fiscs, Constantius forced ex-curial senators to pay up any outstanding debts to their hometowns.⁷¹ In this ruling Constantius orders that *curiales* who have evaded their municipal duties by acquiring senatorial rank (which exempted them from curial duties – very much to the displeasure of Libanius, who repeatedly attempted to retain wealthy *curiales* in Antioch to assure their future (financial) contribution to the city) were to be removed from the *album* containing the names of the members of the senate and be returned to their municipal councils.⁷² Such persons were, however, allowed to remain in the senate, and therefore retain their senatorial rank, if they had already served as praetors (*praetorum honore perfuncti*); they had merely to meet their fiscal obligations to their home councils, and were ordered to reimburse their municipalities.

Traditionally the inclusion of *curiales* in the senate was seen as an aspect of the decline of the municipal councils in the late Roman Empire, but more recently this view of a demise of the municipal councils has come under attack in light of ample evidence to the contrary.⁷³ At any rate, after a

⁶⁸ *PLRE* I: 791 (Sabinus 5).

⁶⁹ *Amm.* 17.7.6.

⁷⁰ *PLRE* I: 104 (Aristaenetus 1).

⁷¹ *CTh* 12.1.48 (361).

⁷² See the case of the *curialis* Aetius, who sought membership in Constantinople: Lib. *Ep.* 76.

⁷³ Lepelley (1979) 252 n. 2 noted that *curiales* were not fleeing primarily from the fiscal burdens of curial roles (since acquiring senatorial rank entailed even greater expense) but from the *munera personalia*, which meant making oneself available in person. Laniado (2002) 4–18 convincingly argues against a dramatic decline

The Creation of a Second Senate

period of targeted recruitment to the new senate, the recruitment of *curiales* to it was again handled more restrictively.⁷⁴ These administrative reforms and the new career opportunities they granted had important cultural repercussions. There is evidence that the increased opportunities in the provincial administration prompted a demand for the teaching of Latin and Roman law in the East. In response to this development Antioch for instance instituted a civic chair of Roman law in 360; even Libanius, who refrained from using Latin, sought to employ a Latin teacher in his school there.⁷⁵ Yet, due to the high demand for qualified teachers, candidates were often hard to attract: Antioch was turned down by one of its preferred candidates, Silvanus.⁷⁶

Many of the new senators did not issue from established senatorial families, but as senators they had the same rank as those of Rome. In principle it would thus have been possible for them to register also in Rome. In order to establish a new senatorial order in Constantinople, there hence had to

in curial service in the fourth and early fifth centuries; this was less severe than is generally assumed. Foss (1990) 44–7 notes that unwilling *curiales* attracted more attention in antiquity and therefore occupy a prominent place in the modern perception. Imperial legislation reveals that curial evasion put many cities into a difficult position regarding the financing of local games or similar local amenities, and that emperors sought ways to prevent this: Bransbourg (2008). By way of prevention, the imperial administration repeatedly interfered in the municipal administration of municipal lands to guarantee funds locally (see on the proconsul Ampelius on p. 218 and also Cameron (1976) 217–18) and forced senators to leave one son in their hometown: Petit (1955) 344 n. 3. For subsequent imperial attempts to suppress this trend: Jones (1964) 2: 741–3. See also Delmaire (2013) 134 on the limits imposed on *curiales* seeking high office. Also, overall the most common routes for curial evasion were the palatine administration, the army, the bar and the church, professions that enjoyed exemptions from curial duties: Jones (1964) 2: 548–50, e.g. Eunomios *PCBE* 3: 295 (Eunomios 1), bishop of Cyzicus in 360/61, and son of the *curialis PCBE* 3: 281 Eugenios 1, bishop of Laodicea ad Mare in Syria in 315–40. On *curiales* in the church, see also McLynn (2006).

⁷⁴ Schmidt-Hofner (2008) 97–101; Chastagnol (1992) 265; Garbarino (1988) 287 n. 232; Dagron (1974) 134.

⁷⁵ Lib. *Ep.* 433 (355), 478 (356), 486, 507, 209 for the civic chair; Lib. *Ep.* 534 (356), 359 (356/7) for Libanius' Latin teacher. Libanius was late to adjust to this development, for it is clear that Latin teachers must have existed in Antioch before, given the number of Antiocheans who rose to high offices that required a fluent command of Latin in the 340s and 350s, as examined in this chapter and Chapters 3–5. For other Antiochean Latin speakers, see Geiger (1999), esp. 613–17.

⁷⁶ Lib. *Ep.* 507.

be strict rules regulating the distribution of senatorial men between Rome and Constantinople. The solution was a division of the senatorial order on geographical lines.⁷⁷ This division seems to have been imposed around 357. While there is agreement that senators from the eastern prefecture were sent to Constantinople, the fate of the senators in the prefecture of Illyricum, including Greece, remains debated.⁷⁸ The crux lies in the interpretation of *CTh* 6.4.11:

Si quos in urbe Roma perfunctos esse cla[r]uerit magistratibus, ad nulla editionum genera deuoentur. Urbis autem Romae curiam callide declinantes [clar]jissimo praeditos nomine per Achaiam, Macedon[am] tumque Illyricum iussimus quaeri raro uel num[quam] sedem dignitatis propriae frequentantes, quibus lo[coru]m grata confinia possint esse iucunda, ut carens mo[ra] llonginqua peregrinationis debeat dignitas concu[pisce]i.

If it should become clear that any persons have performed to the full the duties of the magistracies in the City of Rome, they shall not be summoned for the production of any kind of games. However, if any persons should artfully avoid the senate house of the City of Rome, though endowed with the title of *clarissimus*, we have issued orders that they shall be sought out throughout Achaea, Macedonia and all Illyricum, and also because they rarely or never frequent the seat of their own dignity. It should be possible for the pleasant neighbourhoods of these places to be delightful to them, so that

⁷⁷ On this division, see also Heather (1998) 187–8; Chastagnol (1992) 260–1; Dagron (1974) 127–9.

⁷⁸ In the fourth century the term ‘Illyricum’ may refer to either a region or a praetorian prefecture, which were not, however, identical to each other. I suggest that here Constantius is referring to the prefecture of Illyricum and not to the entire Illyrican region. On the *Verona List*, which is currently dated to 314, the region known as Illyricum encompassed three dioceses, see Limberis (2005) 444: the diocese of Pannonia, comprising the provinces Dalmatia, Savensis, Pannonia Inferior, Valeria, Pannonia Superior, Noricum Mediterraneum and Noricum Ripariense; the diocese of Moesia, which included the provinces of the Greek peninsula; and, finally, the diocese of Thrace. Constantine later subdivided the diocese of Moesia into the dioceses of Dacia in the north and Macedonia in the south, which also included the province of Achaea. The Pannonias seem to have belonged to the prefecture of Italy, but Dacia, Macedonia (which included the provinces – confusingly of the same name – Macedonia, and Achaea), and Thrace constituted the prefecture of Illyricum, see Bon (1951) 3. This is not the prefecture of Illyricum described in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, where there is a different nomenclature, organization, and division, but there is good reason to assume the *Verona List* of 314 is a better guide to the structure of the administration in 357 than the *Notitia* from 425. On the *Verona List*: Zuckermann (2002); Barnes (1996) 548–50; Jones (1954).

The Creation of a Second Senate

they shall seek the dignity (of their rank) without the hindrance of a long and strenuous journey.⁷⁹

It has been suggested that the law concerns the reassignment of senators from the Balkans and Greece to Rome.⁸⁰ If so, it may have been directed at Roman senators who had fled the city under Magnentius and settled further east in the regions controlled by Constantius.⁸¹ This is not an unreasonable suggestion. Three years earlier, in March 354, an imperial letter was dispatched to the praetorian prefect of Italy and Africa, Hilarianus, instructing him to compel senators to take up their duties as praetors and to register with the *consuales* in Rome (for the assessment of their tax rate);⁸² a second letter was sent to the urban prefect Orfitus informing him of the emperor's notice to Hilarianus, in order to ensure smooth collaboration between prefects.⁸³ These two rulings belong to a set of legislation issued in 353/4 to the prefects to reorganize the state after the removal of Magnentius, but this does not alter the fact that absenteeism was a continuous problem in Rome.⁸⁴ The similarities between the wording and content of these two rulings on the senate of Rome and the law *CTh* 6.4.11 examined above may seem to invite the conclusion that this law too concerned the recall of senators from Illyricum to Rome. Further, in *CTh* 6.4.11 Constantius explicitly exempts former holders of magistracies in Rome from the duty of serving as praetor: *si quos in urbe Roma perfunctos esse cla[r]uerit magistratibus, ad nulla editionum genera deuocentur*.⁸⁵

However, it is difficult to align such a reassignment of senators from the provinces of Illyricum to Rome with the reorganization of the administration of Illyricum in 351. My discussion of the senatorial administration under Constantius

⁷⁹ *CTh* 6.4.11.

⁸⁰ Maraval (2013) 181; Skinner (2008) 130–3; Errington (2006) 152; Vanderspoel (1995) 61–3; Chastagnol (1992) 260, 264; Dagron (1974) 127–8; Piganiol (1972) 387 n. 3.

⁸¹ Skinner (2008) 131. Flight under Magnentius, pp. 279, 309 below.

⁸² *CTh* 6.4.4.

⁸³ *CTh* 6.4.7.

⁸⁴ Post-Magnentian legislation: Porena (2003) 367–8. Laws to curb absenteeism in Rome under the Constantinian dynasty: *CTh* 6.4.3, 7, 17, 18.

⁸⁵ Dagron (1974) 127.

suggested that since 351 Achaëa had been reorganized as part of the eastern senatorial *cursus*. Together with the creation of a *consularis* in the province of Macedonia, this measure was a vital part of the creation of an eastern senatorial *cursus*. It is hence odd that Constantius should then redirect senators of this important province to Rome rather than Constantinople. Indeed, the provinces of Achaëa and Macedonia are explicitly named. There is thus reason to believe that, even though the wording of the law does not indicate whether the senators from Illyricum were sent to Rome or Constantinople, the prosopographical evidence makes it probable that the transfer was to Constantinople rather than Rome.⁸⁶

CTh 6.4.11 only concerned senators with residency in the prefecture of Illyricum, but the same obligation to register in Constantinople applied to the senators from the eastern prefecture.⁸⁷ This is neatly demonstrated by the career of the former *consularis* of Macedonia, Olympius.⁸⁸ Olympius, a member of a leading curial family in Antioch,⁸⁹ gained senatorial status upon his appointment in Macedonia. When he retired from his senatorial office in 356, he registered in Rome, suggesting that there were no strict rules in place prior to the legislation discussed above. The motive to register in Rome was, it seems, in part financial: in Rome Olympius was exempted from the senatorial tax; in Constantinople, however, no exemptions were granted.⁹⁰

In the summer of 359 Olympius was living in his native city of Antioch and was forced to reregister in Constantinople.⁹¹ In the process he encountered several problems, which he sought to resolve with the help of Libanius, an old family friend. Libanius wrote letters to Honoratus, the prefect of Constantinople, who

⁸⁶ Achaëa: see pp. 186–7, 217–18 above. Redirection to Constantinople: also argued by Löhken (1982) 104; Klein (1979) 108; Edbrooke (1976) 55; Jones (1964) 1: 132.

⁸⁷ Chastagnol (1992) 260–1; Dagron (1974) 127–9.

⁸⁸ *PLRE* I: 643 (Olympius 3).

⁸⁹ Petit (1957) 368 no. 2.

⁹⁰ Lib. *Ep.* 252. See also Cabouret (2000) 102–4. Pace Skinner (2008) 133–48.

⁹¹ Olympius' transfer is also discussed in Skinner (2008) 137–41; Errington (2006) 156–7; Bradbury (2004) 260–1; Chastagnol (1992) 262–4, (1976) 351–2; Dagron (1974) 129; Petit (1957) 366–70, 376–9.

The Creation of a Second Senate

could intervene in the election of praetors as well as in the assessment of senatorial wealth to determine their annual tax liabilities, and he could also waive the residency requirement imposed on senators.⁹² Libanius also addressed Themistius, who had great political influence in the senate.⁹³ In addition letters were sent to Clearchus, a former student of Nicocles and a close acquaintance of Themistius. In this harsh letter Clearchus is rebuked for his failure to assist Olympius, whose registration is not running smoothly.⁹⁴ It seems that, when the officials in Constantinople were processing Olympius' transfer dossier in late 359, the enrolment of new senators in the senate of Constantinople was in full swing: as Scott Bradbury has noted, the fact that in his second letter to Themistius on this matter Libanius reintroduced Olympius' problems in the same detail as in his first (which antedated the second by a year), as well as the several years over which the matter was delayed, suggest that the desks of the relevant officials in Constantinople were swamped in this period.⁹⁵

The administrative effort connected with the registration of senators was considerable and the matter itself complex. In Libanius' letter to Themistius of winter 360/61 on Olympius' exemption from the senatorial surtax (the *follis*), Libanius notes that Constantinople had 'not yet been schooled in such practices'.⁹⁶ Bernadette Cabouret rightly notes that this suggests that as an institution the senate of Constantinople was unfinished – some key legislative instruments were still to be introduced.⁹⁷ This seems to have concerned in particular the rights and duties of its membership. In these letters Libanius petitioned that Olympius be granted an exemption from this obligation on the ground that he had to look after his frail mother (or so he claimed).⁹⁸ This was

⁹² Lib. *Ep.* 251 and *Ep.* 265, excellently discussed in Bradbury (2004) 102–5.

⁹³ Lib. *Ep.* 70, *Ep.* 77 and *Ep.* 252.

⁹⁴ Lib. *Ep.* 253.

⁹⁵ Bradbury (2004) 121.

⁹⁶ Lib. *Ep.* 252 with Cabouret (2000) 103.

⁹⁷ Cabouret (2000) 103 n. 204.

⁹⁸ Lib. *Ep.* 251.

relevant because – so these letters indicate – senators were expected to reside on the Bosphorus. Olympius also requested a deferral of his liability to serve as praetor.⁹⁹ In his defence Libanius referred to a recent law of Constantius, which had ruled that praetorships were to be assigned in the order of their entry to the senate, so that longer standing members of the institution served before the new recruits.¹⁰⁰ This ruling, which is not preserved elsewhere, will have been part of comprehensive legislation expanding the membership of the new senate; it was issued, it seems, prior to Libanius' first letter on behalf of Olympius in 359. If Libanius' words are to be trusted, it appears that in this law Constantius had granted new senators – those who were transferred from Rome to Constantinople but probably also new recruits from among the eastern elites – a deferral of service as praetors, at the expense of more established senators in Constantinople who had not yet fulfilled this liability but were better placed, or more influential, to avoid it. If that is so, this will have smoothed the transfer and increased the attractiveness of a seat in the Constantinopolitan senate.

The transfer of senators from Rome had several advantages for Constantius' senatorial project in Constantinople. First, the transferred senators made a considerable contribution to the expansion of the Constantinople senate's membership. Secondly, the transfer implied that the new senate had assumed Rome's authority over senators resident in the East. It was thus a powerful statement about the existence of the senate of Constantinople as a parallel institution to Rome and the parity of the two institutions. Finally, these senators had experience in holding a senatorial Roman rank, or, as Constantius put it

⁹⁹ In his third letter to Themistius, Libanius refers to a liturgy that Olympius undertook in Rome, of which there were three categories. This must be the quaestorship, so Olympius was not exempted from the obligation of a praetorship in Constantinople: Lib. *Ep.* 252; quaestorship: Bradbury (2004) 123 n. 105. *Contra*: Cabouret (2000) 104 n. 208, Chastagnol (1992) 262, and Jones (1964) 2: 430 with 3 n. 51, who argue for the praetorship.

¹⁰⁰ Lib. *Ep.* 251.10.

The Creation of a Second Senate

in his letter for Themistius, ἀξιώματος Ῥωμαϊκοῦ.¹⁰¹ They were hence in a position to uphold the values Constantius wanted to flourish in the new senate: wealth, education and participation in government.¹⁰²

This section has revealed the considerable administrative and social reforms that were attached to the establishment a second senate in Constantinople. It was necessary to expand the ranks of the new senate intensively by recruiting new senators from the municipal elites of the eastern cities. This was made possible also by the creation of new senatorial posts in the administration that would be attractive to potential senators. There was also a need to define the realm of authority of the new senate, and to indicate where senators had to register. In 357 Constantius seems to have ruled that senators in the prefectureships of Illyricum and the East henceforth belonged to the new senate in Constantinople. This transfer added many experienced senators to the ranks of the new institution, but also powerfully underlined the parity of the two senates. As has rightly been suggested, 357 was hence a crucial year in the establishment of a second senate in Constantinople.¹⁰³ However, the recruitment of new senators alongside the transfer of established ones from Rome to Constantinople also created problems: as the following section reveals, in this period Constantius had to rule repeatedly on the praetorships in Constantinople. This had formerly been the entry requirement for the senate, but now it had become a financial burden that could be imposed in retrospect. Evasion was therefore rife, also in view of the many changes the senate underwent in this period.

¹⁰¹ *Dem. Const.* 21a.

¹⁰² It was not impossible at this date to change from one senatorial realm to the other, but it was a rare event: Dagron (1974) 136–7. Note also the later attachment of Thrace and Macedonia to Constantinople in 384: *CTh* 6.2.14. On eastern senators in the Roman senate in earlier centuries, see Halfmann (2007), (1982); Fernoux (2004) 484–9; Mitchell (1993a) 1: 151–4; Devrecker (1982); Chastagnol (1976) 341–3.

¹⁰³ Vanderspoel (1995) 55–65.

Practorships

An imperial edict sent from Constantius' court in Milan to Araxius, the proconsul of Constantinople, was read out in the senate on 11 April 356. It contained revised regulations for the election of praetors in Constantinople.¹⁰⁴ Constantius ordered that the nominations of the candidates for praetorships were to be held on his birthday: *die natali meo Constanti Augusti idibus Augusti ac deinceps designationibus curam operam dare sancimus*.¹⁰⁵ In this way the new praetors were 'born' on the same day as Constantius, 7 August,¹⁰⁶ which granted a special prestige to the nominations. If the nominations could not be completed in one or two days, the election board was to continue in session as long as necessary: *quod si forsitan dies unus alterue non sufficit, tot haec utilitas occupet, quot esse monstrauerit necessarios negotii magnitudo*.

Nominations were an important matter; a binding appointment to a praetorship came into effect either through the formal acceptance of election by the candidate, or the expiration of a set time limit in which the candidate could accept (or appeal) the decision.¹⁰⁷ Nomination was therefore a definite

¹⁰⁴ *CTh* 6.4.8, 9, 10. *CTh* 6.4.10 is dated to 9 May 356 in the manuscripts of the *Code*, yet Seeck (1919) 45, 202 rightly suggested dating it to 11 April and seeing it as part of the ruling issued to Constantinople that is set out in *CTh* 6.4.8, 9. His conclusion was accepted by the editors of Project Volterra, Löhken (1982) 124, and Dagron (1974) 126. *Contra*: Giglio (2007), who argues for Rome as the addressee of the law. Chastagnol (1992) 268–70 argued that the law concerns the admission of *adlecti* to the senate in Rome. As Löhken (1982) 124–6 convincingly showed, this interpretation of *CTh* 6.4.10 is mistaken. First, this law is not addressed to the senate in Rome, but the senate in Constantinople. More importantly, Chastagnol's interpretation rests on two misinterpretations of the Latin text, which are necessary to support his view that the law concerns the admission of *adlecti*. The correct reading of this law, as proposed by Löhken (1982, 126), is that it is forbidden to buy a seat among the ex-praetors (who are exempt from the costly praetorships), as this status (as *ex praetor* or *functus*) within the senate can only be achieved either by holding a praetorship or by an exemption from the emperor (the *adlectio inter consulares*). Should such irregular acquisition of the title of *ex praetor* have occurred, it is to be reversed. *CTh* 6.4.10 is therefore not proof of the admission of *adlecti* by senatorial vote, but defines, together with *CTh* 6.4.8,9, the procedure for the designation and nomination of praetors in Constantinople. Löhken's conclusions are accepted by Garbarino (1988) 63, 284–9, 377.

¹⁰⁵ *CTh* 6.4.10.

¹⁰⁶ Salzman (1990) 134 table 5; Dagron (1974) 126.

¹⁰⁷ Sirks (2003) 17–18. Sirks also remarks that there cannot have been more candidates than available praetorships as the acceptance of election by all candidates would

The Creation of a Second Senate

appointment, to be cancelled only through successful appeal. As a result these nominations will have been amongst the most hotly debated decisions of the senate, and could easily last several days (as Constantius realized). Further, Constantius put in place several formal requirements to ensure the validity of the elections. In order to be able, as an assembly, to pass a valid vote on such important issues, Constantius fixed a quorum. Fifty senators were necessary: *placet, ne minus quinquaginta c[laris]simi ueniant in senatum; certum est namque hos [nu]mero large abundare substantiam uirtuti omnim[en]dae*.¹⁰⁸ Fifty senators was about one sixth of the total membership of the senate: a year later in 357 the assembly still numbered only around 300 members.¹⁰⁹

Given the importance of these elections, the emperor ruled that only the senate had the right to nominate praetors; (other) higher magistrates were not authorized to interfere: *has lege sancimus arbitrio ues[tro no]minationes solitas fieri usurpatione iudi[cum cessan]te*.¹¹⁰ Who were these *iudices*? A later ruling on evasion of the praetorship sheds light on the matter. As part of his substantial legislation on the status of Constantinople and its senate in 361, Constantius rebuked governors (*iudices*) who refused to assist the work of the senate.¹¹¹ They should have acted upon a written request by the senate (issued by its official head, the prefect of Constantinople) to summon nominated praetors to Constantinople. This means that the governors were asked to notify those *uari clarissimi* who had been designated praetors, and force them to comply with the demand of the

then have exceeded the number of available opportunities. See also the legislation on membership in the senate of Constantinople discussed in subsequent sections, e.g. *CTh* 6.4.12–13, 15.

¹⁰⁸ *CTh* 6.4.9.

¹⁰⁹ *Them. Or.* 34.13. Under Alexander Severus in the early third century, a quorum of seventy senators was necessary for meetings in Rome (with around 600 members), see Chastagnol (1992) 237. This perhaps suggests that the obligation to participate in senatorial meetings was stricter – or perhaps more strictly observed – by the time of Constantius (at least in Constantinople) as proposed by Löhken (1982) 104–5.

¹¹⁰ *CTh* 6.4.8. In Chapter 1 (p. 38), I discussed that Constantine returned the right of electing quaestors and praetors to the senate in Rome (as indicated by *CIL* VI 1708 = 31906 = *ILS* 1222 with Seck 1884). This rule was now also applied in the senate in Constantinople.

¹¹¹ *CTh* 6.4.13.3.

senate that they go to Constantinople or notify the senate of their acceptance of the nomination (by making their pledges, *pignora*), and send their documents to the *consuales* so they could be assigned to one of the three praetorships.¹¹² As to the identity of the *iudices*, *CTh* 6.4.13.3 is referring to governors. Yet praetorian prefects, too, were involved, as a letter of Libanius to Themistius from winter 358/9 reveals.¹¹³ Libanius asked his addressee to work towards the confirmation of a ruling by the praetorian prefect Hermogenes which had exempted the young senator Julianus from the *foliis*, the annual senatorial tax introduced by Constantine.¹¹⁴ The election of praetors was thus entangled in a complex net of conflicting interests, and was further complicated by the fact that many of the new Constantinopolitan senators, by law required to live in Constantinople, were resident in the provinces:¹¹⁵ very few of the senators mentioned by Libanius lived in Constantinople, but instead returned to their cities when they retired from their posts.¹¹⁶

In the ruling from 356 Constantius outlined the correct election procedure and ruled against fraud and the illegal acquisition of the rank of praetor (that is, of a senator who had already served as praetor), or of any other rank of *functi*.¹¹⁷ The emperor also reminded the senate that all senators were obliged to take on praetorships unless specifically exempted by

¹¹² Obligations of provincial senators to comply with the demands of the praetorship: also *CTh* 6.4.21, 22.

¹¹³ Governors: *CTh* 6.4.13.3 and commentary by Pharr (1952); contrast Giglio (2007) 73, who holds that these are also the *consuales* mentioned in *CTh* 6.4.13.2.

¹¹⁴ Lib. *Ep.* 40, see Bradbury (2004) 119–21. On the *foliis*, see Chapter 1 (p. 40) and Moser (2016b) 438–9 with further refs.

¹¹⁵ Residence requirement lifted through waiver for provincial senators: Chastagnol (1992) 263–4, (1976) 354; Jones (1964) 2: 553; Petit (1957) 357. Technically, imperial approval for leave from Rome, the so-called *commeatus*, was still in place in the reign of Theodosius II (*CJ* 12.1.15, 18); Jones (1964) 2: 536–7. The provincial domicile of Constantinopolitan senators remained a constant concern, as demonstrated by later modifications to the procedures for praetorian nominations (e.g. *CTh* 6.4.21, 22).

¹¹⁶ Libanius' students: Bradbury (2004); Petit (1955), (1957).

¹¹⁷ A later law, *CTh* 6.4.11 (357), calls them *perfuncti*. See also n. 104 for a refutation of Chastagnol's (1992, 268–70) argument that this passage concerns the co-opting of *adlecti* by the senate.

The Creation of a Second Senate

the emperor, for instance by adlection.¹¹⁸ That Constantius had to issue this warning indicates that at least some senators had tried to sit in the senate without serving as praetors. However, this does not reflect a general aversion to membership but only to serving as praetor, as is revealed by the fact that Constantius also had to rule against the transfer of the title of praetor to other family members, and to rebuke candidates who had successfully applied for a praetorship with the intention of passing it on to their clarissimate sons or grandsons even if they did not meet the requirements.¹¹⁹ In 356 the honour of being a senator in Constantinople thus seems to have been highly attractive; its conferment had to be regulated with care to ensure the exclusivity of the institution.

These regulations reveal a far more complex organization of the praetorships than those documented in the two laws of 340 discussed earlier in this book.¹²⁰ Most crucially, they show that these praetorian games were no longer the municipal games of the *curia* of Constantinople, but highly elaborate financial obligations imposed on men who lived outside Constantinople (in the provinces). They are thus a highly illuminating reflection of the gradual promotion of Constantinople to a second imperial senate in Rome.

The expansion of the senate's membership in the second half of the 350s necessitated even tighter regulation of the modes of access to the senate and the praetorship, in order to respond to the influx of individuals who acquired senatorial rank primarily through promotion in the administration. André Chastagnol has argued that these new senators were exempted from the burden of serving as praetors, and suggests that Constantius recruited them by general adlection as part of a policy to expand the senate quickly.¹²¹ The evidence, however, points rather in the opposite direction. Legal evidence shows that Constantius sought to redress the problem that had been created by the steady influx of new senators who

¹¹⁸ *CTh* 6.4.10.1 with Dagron (1974) 126–7.

¹¹⁹ *CTh* 6.4.9.

¹²⁰ *CTh* 6.4.5, 6, examined in Chapter 4, pp. 141–7.

¹²¹ Chastagnol (1992) 264–5; (1976) 352.

acquired senatorial rank through office (rather than through election to a praetorship as had been traditional).¹²² A letter to the senate issued on 22 May 359 in Sirmium reveals that by then (at the latest) senators who entered the senate by holding office still had to serve as praetors in retrospect, *CTh* 6.4.15 (trans. Project Volterra).

Meministis profecto, patres conscripti, nec ullius temporis auellet obliuio, quod Facundus ex proconsule et Arsenius ex uicariis praetorum insignibus splenduerunt, nec quisdam horum putauit esse praeturam intra propriam dignitatem. Quod autem inlustrius his repperitur exemplis? Debuerat profecto res ista, debuerat alios etiam commonere proconsulari et uicariae praefecturae praeditos potestate non esse praeturam minorem propriis meritis. Oportuit adpeti splendorum fascas, decuit tanti nominis gloriam concupisci, nec aliquem omnino fas erat nominationibus reluctari, quae nec ratio prohibet et exempla confirmant. A uobis ergo praetores placuit designari et uestro eligi arbitrio iussimus, qui suscipiant fascas editionibus operam praebituri, nec ad notitiam nos tram praefectiue praetorio clarissimi uiri super nationibus ullis referri.

You surely remember, Conscript Fathers, and no oblivion of time whatsoever shall take away that memory, how Facundus, *ex proconsul*, and Arsenius, *ex vicarius*, were distinguished by the *insignia* of the praetorship, nor did either of these men consider the praetorship as beneath his own dignity. Moreover, what can be found more illustrious than these precedents? This example certainly ought, indeed it ought, also to have reminded others endowed with proconsular power or that of the office of *vicarius*, that the praetorship is not inferior to their own merits. The shining *fascas* ought to have been sought, it was fitting that the glory of so great a title should be much desired, nor was it at all right for anyone to resist the appointment, which reason does not prohibit and the precedents confirm. Therefore, it is decided that the praetors are to be nominated by you, and we have commanded that by your judgement persons are to be chosen to receive the *fascas* and to devote their attention to the giving of games, nor is any referral concerning appointments to be brought to our attention or to that of the praetorian prefect, *uir clarissimus*.¹²³

In the first part of this letter the emperor upbraids those members of the senate who have avoided serving as praetors.

¹²² Jones (1964) 2: 530–2.

¹²³ It is not clear whether this law was addressed to Rome or Constantinople, a question that has sparked discussion: Garbarino (1988) 191 and Malcus (1967) 149 n. 2 argue, against the majority of the scholarship, for Rome.

The Creation of a Second Senate

He addresses, in particular, ex-proconsuls and *ex vicarii*, that is those already advanced on the senatorial *cursus honorum*. The ruling reveals that under Constantius, when membership in the senate could be acquired by appointment to a senatorial post, not all proconsuls and *vicarii* had served as praetors (as had been the rule prior to the expansion of the senate).¹²⁴ This group must be the established Constantinopolitan senators mentioned in Libanius' letter to Honoratus.¹²⁵ Yet the *munus* was, Constantius explained, not beneath the dignity, not *intra propriam dignitatem*, of ex-proconsuls and *ex vicarii* who had not yet served as praetors (and were thus not yet among the *perfuncti*).¹²⁶ The senators should remember, and strive to emulate, the ex-proconsul Facundus and the *ex vicarius* Arsenius who had both held praetorships. In 359 a senatorial *ex vicarius* who had not yet served as praetor could thus be called up to meet the obligation of the praetorship even though he had reached a high position in the *cursus honorum*, and subsequent to his inclusion in the senate. This rule, which, so Constantius insists, is based on precedence, thus fits nicely with the law mentioned in Libanius' letter to Themistius concerning Olympius, in which Constantius ordered that established members of the institution were to hold praetorships prior to new recruits. By 361 proconsuls had been upgraded in the hierarchy in that an exemption from the praetorship was granted to them, and to even higher ranking officials, but not to the *vicarii* or other senatorial officials.¹²⁷

Paolo Garbarino, who has presented a detailed discussion of this ruling, concluded that it deals only with new senators, *homines novi*, who lacked senatorial rank prior to their appointment to these posts but were able to join the senate through it.¹²⁸ I am not convinced: in Constantius'

¹²⁴ Jones (1964) 2: 542. At Jones (1964) 1: 134 he rules out the possibility that there were senators who had not yet performed as praetors.

¹²⁵ Lib. *Ep.* 251.

¹²⁶ Distinction between *perfuncti* and simple senators: e.g. *CTh* 12.1.48 and *CTh* 6.4.11.

¹²⁷ *CTh* 6.4.13.4. Libanius' letter: *Ep.* 252, see p. 232 above.

¹²⁸ Garbarino (1988) 185–91. This view is also prominent in Dillon (2015) 56–8.

administration, such high-ranking offices were not awarded to inexperienced men. These high-ranking senators will thus have held lower ranking senatorial governorships before (as *consularis* or *praeses*, as seen in the careers examined above). They will hence have joined the senate at an earlier stage. But even in relation to these lower posts it is not necessary to assume that only new men sought them; it is equally possible (and in view of the rise of the traditional senatorial families under Constantine even more likely) that *viri clarissimi* by birth sought appointment to high-ranking posts in the administration to escape the obligation of a praetorship.¹²⁹

Failure to meet this obligation because of financial difficulties probably led to exclusion from the senatorial order, in the same way as in Rome young *clarissimi* by birth lost their senatorial status if they could not meet the demands of senatorial rank (the quaestorship), as is suggested by Symmachus' *Oration* 8. In this oration Symmachus was supporting the application for this office of a young man, Valerius Fortunatus.¹³⁰ Fortunatus had been born *clarissimus* but lost his rank as a minor.¹³¹ He had been called up to serve as quaestor, but since his mother had refused to provide the necessary funds, claiming impoverishment, the emperor had ruled that Fortunatus was to relinquish his senatorial rank, leaving him *uacuus dignitatis*. But not for long: shortly thereafter his hometown Emerita recalled him and asked him to satisfy his duties to his place of residence, that is, his curial obligations. Upon reaching adulthood Fortunatus appealed the ruling and, through Symmachus, applied for readmission to the senatorial order by the award of a quaestorship.

In Constantinople, where no quaestorships are documented, this rule was applied to the praetorships.¹³² Here, the holding

¹²⁹ Situation under Constantine: see [Chapter 1](#).

¹³⁰ Jones (1964) 2: 530 offers a lucid discussion of this speech.

¹³¹ Symm. *Or.* 8.3. *PLRE* I: 370 (Fortunatus 5), 865 (Symmachus 4).

¹³² Neither the quaestorship nor the suffect consulate can be documented in Constantinople, but it is unclear whether they were never introduced in Constantinople or simply not recorded for posterity; both offices were also only rarely included in public inscriptions in Rome in this period. On the lack of the quaestorship in Constantinople see also Löhken (1982) 122.

The Creation of a Second Senate

of this office finalized the inclusion of new men into the senate.¹³³ Wealthy senatorial families could use the praetorship to include their sons or other family members in the senate even if those relatives did not (yet) have the means to fund it.¹³⁴ By this time the praetorship (and the quaestorship in Rome) was thus part of the *condicio senatorialis*, a set of liabilities and obligations that applied to members of the senatorial order, the *muneribus iniunctis* mentioned in legislation imposed on men of senatorial rank, such as the *follis* tax and the praetorship.¹³⁵ In a similar way *curiales* were subject to liabilities to their hometown, an obligation called *condicio curialis*.¹³⁶ Only very few senators were exempted from the obligation to hold games as praetors or consuls: these lucky few were the imperial *adlecti* like Themistius.¹³⁷

The second part of *CTh* 6.4.15, from the year 359, then indicates that the nomination of praetors as outlined in Constantius' communication to the senate in 356 had not gone ahead without difficulties. Constantius explained that matters concerning the senate were its business, not the emperor's or that of the prefect's, *nec ad notit[iam nos]tram praefectiue praetorio*.¹³⁸ Perhaps the electors had previously tried to avoid this difficult task. For it is clear that the nomination of praetors was a difficult issue. Given the small number of praetorships, only a very small percentage of the senate would ever be called up and be forced to cover the expenses attached to it. Some senators sought to avoid the burden by all possible means, and in particular the established senators in Constantinople were

¹³³ *CTh* 12.1.48.

¹³⁴ *CTh* 6.4.10. In analogy, wealthy curial families were often keen to expedite the inclusion of their sons into the council. Their fathers often organized games in their name if they were still too young to present themselves for the liturgies: see e.g. the example of Obodianus of Antioch, who performed several liturgies for his son Argyrius (Norman 1954 45), see Chapter 4, p. 124 above.

¹³⁵ *CTh* 6.4.7.

¹³⁶ On the *condicio curialis* and its similarity to the *condicio* of *coloni*: Sirks (1993), (2008) esp. 124–7; Jacques (1985) esp. 318–19. The *condicio curialis* was also hereditary, so that young *curiales* had to take up their father's liabilities towards the city upon his death, as happened for instance to Albanus and Achillius in Ancyra: Foss (1990) 44–7.

¹³⁷ *Them. Or.* 26.326.

¹³⁸ *CTh* 6.4.15 (359).

able to exercise their influence on the election boards to shift the burden onto absent senators and new arrivals (as implied by Libanius' letter to Honoratus discussed above), which must have made the nomination of praetors a tedious and nerve-racking exercise. Another possibility is that both emperor and praetorian prefect had been approached with petitions to grant exemptions from the praetorship to individual senators.

Two letters of Libanius suggest that several senators attempted to play this complex system to their advantage. The first, regarding petitions to the emperor, is one of the two letters Libanius sent to Honoratus on behalf of Olympius. It reassured Honoratus that Olympius' successful petition to the emperor regarding exemption from the praetorship was not intended to undermine his authority as urban prefect.¹³⁹ The second letter was sent to Themistius in 358/9 on behalf of Julianus, a new senator from Tarsus, who sought relief from the senatorial *follis* tax and the praetorship.¹⁴⁰ Themistius is asked to confirm Julianus' exemption from the senatorial tax, granted to him by the praetorian prefect Hermogenes. Hermogenes had no real authority in the matter, but, given his rank, his support will have been a powerful lever to use on the influential figures in Constantinople – the urban prefect and the leading senators – in Julianus' favour. These letters reveal the conflicting interests that underpinned the nominations of praetors in Constantinople, which may have motivated Constantius to clarify where responsibility for the nomination of praetors rested: on the senate.

The law also indicates that the individuals involved considered the quality of the election board a crucial matter. Probably to make this expensive burden more attractive, or to improve the authority of the election board of the praetorship, in a parallel law to the one just examined the emperor ruled in 359 that only ex-praetors who had already given games in Constantinople were allowed to designate praetors.¹⁴¹ Two years later, in 361,

¹³⁹ Lib. *Ep.* 265.

¹⁴⁰ Lib. *Ep.* 40; *PLRE* I: 471 (Iulianus 14).

¹⁴¹ *CTh* 6.4.14, issued together with *CTh* 6.4.15.

The Creation of a Second Senate

Constantius added two further praetorships and raised the costs attached to them, in order to force senators to share the burden of public spending in Constantinople. Henceforth three praetors had to organize public entertainments, while two others had to contribute a certain amount to public works instead.¹⁴² Praetors could then engrave their name on the buildings that had been constructed in that year.¹⁴³

Alongside these modifications regarding the praetorships themselves, Constantius further increased the authority of the election board and ordered that only the most senior members of the senate were to preside over the election (proconsuls, ex-praetorian prefects, ex-proconsuls, ex-praetors and Themistius).¹⁴⁴ Praetors were nominated, and once a sufficient number of names had been obtained, the candidates were assigned to their praetorship by lot: *sed ante decennium legitimo senatus consulto pr[ae]tores designate editionem praeturasque ipsas senatus arbitrio sortiantur*.¹⁴⁵ The words *senatus arbitrio* may suggest that this procedure, the use of the lot as a means of allocating the praetorships to the nominated candidates, was introduced by the election board. If so, it may represent an attempt by the electors to unburden themselves

¹⁴² *CTh* 6.4.13.1, 2. I discuss the names of these praetorships in 361 as well as their costs in [Appendix F](#). Giglio (2007) argues that there were tougher rules (and higher prices) for the praetorship in Rome than in Constantinople, and that these differences were politically motivated, but I think these differences are the result of various factors and may hence reflect rather the different size of the populace of the respective cities or differences in senatorial self-display. Note also *CTh* 6.4.24 (376) imposing a cap on the amounts that could be spent on the praetorships in Constantinople.

¹⁴³ *CTh* 6.4.13.2 appears to suggest that all praetors had their names inscribed on the buildings, regardless of whether they had been allotted to give games, or had only to contribute to the public works. If so, the difference between the two groups of praetors may have been that the game-givers had no say in the building works erected in their name, while the other two praetors did.

¹⁴⁴ It is often, and wrongly, argued that Themistius was proconsul of Constantinople in 358/9; proconsul: Errington (2000) 872; Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 75–6; Daly (1983); *PLRE* I: 890 (Themistius 1). Libanius is a good guide in this context, in that he never calls Themistius ἀρχων (governor) in Constantinople, as he generally addresses proconsuls, but only the more general ἡγεμῶν (leader): Dagron (1974) 224. Accordingly, in the law in question, *CTh* 6.4.12, Themistius is not ex-proconsul, but instead lacks an official title, Bradbury (2004) 119–21; Heather and Moncur (2001) 44–7; Vanderpoel (1995) 106–13.

¹⁴⁵ *CTh* 6.4.13.2.

of the troublesome duty of selecting nominees for the praetorship. Another advantage of this system was that bribery was much more difficult (or so the emperor may have hoped), as were complaints of unfair treatment. A similar procedure was apparently used to elect senators in Rome who had to perform some judicial functions and so had to be present in Rome throughout their term of office like elected praetors: they, too, were chosen by lot, as a law from 354 implies.¹⁴⁶

At this point it will be useful to dwell a little longer on the career of Themistius, which provides important details of the processes at work in the new senate in this period. Themistius, so the ruling from 361 reveals, was not a regular senator: his career was unique, since he was one of the few new arrivals to benefit from an adlection and the advantages that came with it. That he was a leading figure in Constantinople is confirmed by other sources. Libanius' correspondence reveals that Themistius was allowed to join the imperial table when Constantius resided in Constantinople in the winter of 359; this enabled him to request imperial favours for friends and protégés with great success, while taking care not to appear in fancy clothes but, as was more appropriate for a philosopher, in a plain coat; Constantius even invited him to ride in his carriage, which was a rare mark of honour.¹⁴⁷ Of course, Themistius was a special senator regarding the praetorship: given his adlection, Themistius himself did not have to serve as praetor. As he explains in a speech probably from around the same time, *Oration* 26, the senators had included him in their ranks (Themistius here addresses himself in the second person) 'not so that you put on horseraces or theatrical spectacles for them ... , but only so that you will be a source of order and a help to them and share with them the good qualities they believe you cultivate so well' (and so fulfil Constantius' expectations of Themistius' role in the senate as outlined in

¹⁴⁶ *CTh* 6.4.3 (*sortiantur*) to the praetorian prefect of Italy, Maecilius Hilarianus. In Rome, the lot was also used to appoint senatorial provincial governors: Delmaire (2013) 139 with further refs and my discussion on p. 225 above.

¹⁴⁷ Dining with the emperor: Lib. *Ep.* 66. Coat: Heather and Moncur (2001) 12, 106 n. 177. Carriage: Them. *Or.* 31.353a. Mark of honour: Wallace-Hadrill (1982) 40.

The Creation of a Second Senate

the *Demegoria Constantii*). This was no inconvenience to the senate ‘for there are hordes of people who vie and contend with each other to do such things’.¹⁴⁸ It is at first sight difficult to align Themistius’ idealized view of the praetorship in this speech with the evidence for the avoidance of this duty among his contemporaries. However, it is important to remember that not all senators tried to get out of a praetorship: in particular the more established ones welcomed the office as an opportunity to publicize their wealth and connections either by staging glamorous games or by having their names inscribed for eternity on the buildings of Constantinople, including the senators striving to include their sons and other family members in the senate by means of bribery.¹⁴⁹

Constantius’ extensive legislation of 361 reveals that, despite frequent regulations, the praetorships remained a constant worry, as senators were inventive in their excuses not to pay for the staging of games or construction works. To deal with the problem, Constantius ruled that as a concession an interval of ten years between the designation of a praetorship and the holding of the office might be granted,¹⁵⁰ and that one and a half times of the original amount due was to be paid to the urban prefect in recompense for a failure to take up the charge at the assigned time.¹⁵¹

An elaborate system of issuing summons was in place to notify and compel designated praetors to make their way from their provincial homes to Constantinople, which demonstrates the extent to which senators were non-resident, despite the official requirement to live in Rome or Constantinople.¹⁵² Constantius also sought to fight the negligence of provincial governors and their staff, who failed to summon the designated praetors after

¹⁴⁸ Them. *Or.* 26.326 (trans. Penella 2000); date: Penella (2000) viii; perhaps late 350.

¹⁴⁹ *CTh* 6.4.10 (356).

¹⁵⁰ Sirks (2003); on the distinction of the *designatio* and the *nominatio*, see Chastagnol (1992) 268–9 and Löhken (1982) 127–30.

¹⁵¹ *CTh* 6.4.13.

¹⁵² A similar acknowledgement of the fact that most senators did not reside in Rome is *CTh* 6.4.7 of AD 354 asking senators to come to Rome to make their tax declaration. See also *CTh* 6.2.13 (383), which explicitly asks senators to declare in the province in which they had established their residence.

a written order by the urban prefect: they were to pay heavy fines of 10 and 15 pounds of gold respectively. Significantly, he allowed the urban prefect to extend his authority outside Constantinople and into the sphere of authority of the praetorian prefects. The urban prefect's staff was allowed to collect the fines directly in the provinces, even though it was not part of the staff of the praetorian prefect: 'it is our will', so Constantius explained in the law in 361, 'that the dignity of the urban prefect be so increased that this penalty, inflicted on account of dilatoriness of notifications, is to be demanded by the *officiales* who have been sent out by the same urban prefect'.¹⁵³ This suggests that the emperor was no longer willing to accept the failure of the praetorian prefects to collaborate on these issues, and transferred the duty to track down negligent governors to the staff of the urban prefect, ordering them to collect the penalties imposed on the culprits.

To conclude this detailed discussion of Constantius' new praetorship regulations: between 359 and 361 Constantius had put in place various measures intended to ensure that entry to the new senate was closely supervised by the authorities in Constantinople. However, the granting of an interval of ten years to gather the costs attached to the praetorships, which certainly facilitated the senate's task in appointing new praetors, was not without its flaws despite the penalties imposed. While the urban prefect's authority was absolute – with appeal only to the emperor – praetorian prefects nonetheless got involved, granting senators, such as Libanius' former student Julianus, more room for manoeuvre in their efforts to evade their senatorial duties in Constantinople. The new laws further aggravated the problem and necessitated the imposition of further regulations to move against uncooperative provincial governors.¹⁵⁴ Even so, the rule seems to have been a sensible solution of the complex problem of praetorian evasion: in 373 it was implemented in Rome.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ *CTh* 6.4.13.3 (trans. Project Volterra).

¹⁵⁴ E.g. *CTh* 6.4.21 (372), 22 (373); see also *CTh* 6.4.17 (376).

¹⁵⁵ *CTh* 6.4.21.

A New Traditional Senatorial Aristocracy

Now that the procedures for senatorial recruitment in Constantinople have been outlined, it is finally possible to explore the nature of the new senatorial class that emerged in the East. A notable feature, the interest in holding high office, has already been established. However, many of the senatorial governors stemmed from curial families and had not held senatorial rank at birth. Given their non-senatorial family background, it has often been argued that many of the first senators of Constantinople were men of low birth who had risen to prominence through service in the bureaucracy, a view that is based on a passage in a speech of Libanius, *Oration* 42.¹⁵⁶ This speech, discussed already in [Chapter 2](#), was written on behalf of the unsuccessful senator-to-be Thalassius in 388. In it Libanius accuses the senators of Constantinople of applying unjustly harsh standards to the family background of his protégé: earlier men with influence in the senate, he reminds them, came from even less distinguished backgrounds. The senators he names include Tychamenes and Ablabius under Constantine, whom I discussed in [Chapter 2](#). Libanius then lists Philippus, Taurus, Datianus, Helpidius, Domitianus and Dulcitus. Datianus, Philipus and Taurus had been *comites* under Constantine, but advanced under Constantius. Besides Dulcitus, who owed his most prestigious post as proconsul of Asia to Julian,¹⁵⁷ the other five allegedly new, low-born senators became important under Constantius. They are accused of having been sons of simple bath-attendants, fullers and sausage-makers, not members of the provincial aristocracy. However, such poor men would hardly have been able to afford to secure a post in the administration with the extensive authorities which Philippus, Datianus and Taurus were granted by the emperor,¹⁵⁸ or even the lower ranking senatorial governorships examined above. What is more, in his list Libanius includes only exceptionally successful officials.

¹⁵⁶ Lib. *Or.* 42.23, see pp. 64–8 above. Vanderspoel (1995) 66; Jones (1964) 2: 546–57.

¹⁵⁷ *PLRE* I: 274 (Dulcitus 5). Careers: Discussed in Chapters 2, 3 and 5.

¹⁵⁸ Reservation expressed by Skinner (2013) 22–9; Löhken (1982) 123 n. 51.

Indeed, these were singular careers: very few individuals could rise to the (senatorial) rank of praetorian prefect or similar; as I have shown above, most never rose above the level of simple governors. The careers of Philippus, Datianus and Taurus should hence not be generalized: even if these men were from poor backgrounds, they cannot be used as a model for the average Constantinopolitan senator. Indeed, their descendants were so powerful that the question has rightly been raised whether the speech was in fact ever given in public – it is more likely that it was not.¹⁵⁹

What then were the distinctive legal features of a senator in Constantinople?¹⁶⁰ A suitable starting point is Constantius' letter of adlection for Themistius in 355. In it Constantius outlined his vision of the qualities required in a Constantinopolitan senator: 'For these it is the glory of their wealth (χρημάτων εὐκλεία), for others the abundance of their landed property (κτημάτων περιουσία), for some duties to the state (πόννοι δημόσιοι), and for others forcefulness in words (λόγων δεινότης).'¹⁶¹ The requirements for a seat in the senate were thus adequate financial means (movable and landed wealth), an active involvement in the administration and education.¹⁶² His list does not include high (senatorial) birth. However, this does not mean that senators in Constantinople were not required to have a respectable social background, but only that many of the new senators that were recruited in this period did not hold senatorial rank by birth but acquired it by appointment to a senatorial post or a special grant from the emperor as in the case of Themistius ('I have given to you as a

¹⁵⁹ Descendants: pp. 252–4 below. Errington (2006) 158; Norman (2000) 147–8.

¹⁶⁰ On the normative (legal) definition of senators, see Schlinkert (1996) 225–9 and 234–6, who contrasts it with the historiographical definition of nobility found e.g. in Ammianus, Schlinkert (1996) 229–33 and 157–219.

¹⁶¹ *Dem. Const.* 19c, τοὺς μὲν χρημάτων εὐκλεία, τοὺς δὲ κτημάτων περιουσία, ἐνίους δὲ πόννοι δημόσιοι, ἕτερουσ δὲ λόγων δεινότης (trans. after Heather and Moncur 2001).

¹⁶² Themistius himself, while not wealthy (so he claims), will nonetheless have possessed landed property through his father Eugenius who, as Themistius' works reveal (esp. *Or.* 20 and *Or.* 23.291–3), spent his last years working his land (or having his land worked) until his death in late 355. See also Them. *Or.* 30 ('Should one engage in farming', probably written in the early 350s) with Penella (2000) 33–4. On Themistius' early life and family background, see also Watts (2015) 74–6.

clarissimus the unique philosopher’).¹⁶³ The senator also had to be issued from a respectable family, as is suggested by the fact that Constantius is keen to elaborate briefly on Themistius’ family background and the reputation of his father Eugenius in his letter.¹⁶⁴ New members in the senate also had to be citizens and, ideally, resident in Constantinople: hence, the adlected Themistius is praised for having become a citizen and long-term resident of Constantinople on his own account, in a similar vein to how Philippus was praised for having resettled in Constantinople.¹⁶⁵ It is this citizenship in Constantinople which exempted senators from curial duties.¹⁶⁶

Wealth, officeholding, education and a respectable background were hence required in Constantinople, whose membership targeted the wealthy elites of the East. Based on study of the senators mentioned in the works of Libanius and Themistius, current scholarship has emphasized that Constantius’ expectations were met.¹⁶⁷ The new senatorial elite in the East has thus rightly been termed ‘a re-labelling of pre-existing elites’, because ‘the entrenched nobility was able to maintain its status under new circumstances’.¹⁶⁸ In this process social mobility was surprisingly restricted, in that the senatorial hierarchy closely mirrored existing social stratification: rich *curiales* could secure appointment to the post of *consularis*, but only the richest and most successful provincials were able to proceed to a proconsulship or beyond.¹⁶⁹ In the new senate as in the old, wealth thus remained the key to social

¹⁶³ *Dem. Const.* 22b (trans. Heather and Moncur 2001). On senatorial rank as a privilege by birth or one granted by the emperor, see also the evidence discussed in Schlinkert (1996) 94–116.

¹⁶⁴ *Dem. Const.* 22c–23b.

¹⁶⁵ *Dem. Const.* 21d–22b. It is unclear when Themistius acquired Constantinopolitan citizenship: probably born in Paphlagonia, he acquired it perhaps as late as through the adlection by Constantius itself: Them. *Or.* 23.292–3 with Heather and Moncur (2001) 1; Penella (2000) 1; Schlange-Schöningh (1995) 71–2 n. 23. On Philippus: see Chapter 5, pp. 190–6. For the importance of citizenship for membership in the senate, see the case of Caesarius, brother of Gregory of Nazianzus, which I discuss on pp. 268–70.

¹⁶⁶ Löhken (1982) 106; Jones (1964) 536, 543–5, 741–3.

¹⁶⁷ Skinner (2008), (2000); Heather and Moncur (2001) 29–38; Heather (1994).

¹⁶⁸ Harper (2008) 97.

¹⁶⁹ Skinner (2013); Criboire (2007) 214.

advancement. Senatorial office was expensive, also because it necessitated a sound command of Latin and often training in Roman law, which was far more expensive than the traditional Greek *paideia*.¹⁷⁰ Often a seat in the senate was gained only after holding several expensive offices. Thus many new senators, including those from Libanius' network examined above, had been assessors prior to appointment as *consularis* or *vicarius*.¹⁷¹ They had often already served as *notarii*, before being able to advance to senatorial posts and, through them, to a seat in the senate. Their number includes Aelius Claudius Dulcitus, mocked by Libanius; a native of Phrygia, who started his career as *notarius*, and was then able to join the senate.¹⁷² Senatorial rank also obliged a senator to pay the senatorial surtax, the *follis*, and, if nominated, to hold a cost-intensive praetorship.

Legal evidence reveals that the wealth of Constantinople's senators derived largely from land ownership. The close relationship between landholding and senatorial rank is highlighted for instance in the statutory rights of the new senatorial class of Constantinople as outlined in Constantius' comprehensive legislation of 3 May 361.¹⁷³ There the emperor has to reprimand the senators for using several techniques to circumvent the regular *annona* taxation on their landholdings, for instance by registering their tenants as professional traders responsible for their own head tax.¹⁷⁴ Senators were granted the right to send out representatives (*defensores*) to protect the senators' landed interests against the encroachments of provincial governors and city councils,¹⁷⁵ and Constantius also reprimanded senatorial governors for drawing on senatorial resources to fund local building projects.¹⁷⁶ These regulations

¹⁷⁰ Price of education: Cribiore (2007) 187–8; Collinet (1925): 200–4.

¹⁷¹ E.g. *PLRE I*: 104 (Aristaenetos 1), 120 (Atarbios), 174 (Calliopios), 278 (Entrechios 1), 378 (Gaius 6), 472 (Iulianus 15), 602 (Miccalus), 897 (Theodorus 11).

¹⁷² *PLRE I*: 274 (Dulcitus 5).

¹⁷³ Moser (2016b) 438–45 and more generally Schlinkert (1996) 120–5.

¹⁷⁴ *CTh* 13.1.3.

¹⁷⁵ *CTh* 1.28.1.

¹⁷⁶ *CTh* 15.1.7.

demonstrate that many of the new senators were in fact, as was the case in Rome, large landowners from the civic elite of the eastern provinces, that is from those who would benefit from these regulations.¹⁷⁷ Further, as large landowners, senators held widely scattered property portfolios.¹⁷⁸

The ambition of the first senators in Constantinople is also revealed in the literary evidence. Examples are the brothers Demetrius, Julianus and Hierocles from Tarsus, and Olympius and his brothers Miccalus and Evagrius.¹⁷⁹ Both families owned a considerable amount of land, on which they had to pay taxes in Constantinople, as the evidence of Olympius' transfer from the senate of Rome to that in Constantinople reveals. Other families were even more ambitious. Their wealth and influence matched those of the leading Roman aristocrats. Consider, for instance, the proconsul of Constantinople Araxius, whom we met already in [Chapter 5](#). He was able to marry his daughter Vetiana to Constantius' *magister peditum* Agilo; as a young widow she then secured herself a place in the monastery of Macrina the Younger, the influential sister of Gregory of Nyssa, in the province of Pontus. Even more successful was the Antiochean praetorian prefect Thalassius, who owned large landholdings in Antioch, Tyre and the province of Euphratensis.¹⁸⁰ He had two sons. Thalassius junior served at court as *proximus libellorum* in the imperial chancellery of Constantius between 358 and 361; he invested in buildings in Antioch and also looked after the family estates in Euphratensis.¹⁸¹ The other son, Bassianus, was able to marry Prisca, the daughter of the praetorian prefect of the East, Flavius Helpidius (360–1).¹⁸² Thalassius junior and Bassianus managed a staggeringly dispersed set of properties throughout

¹⁷⁷ Landed property of western senators: Sfameni (2004); Matthews (1975/1990); Krause (1987); Vera (1986); and of eastern senators in subsequent centuries: Puech (2015); Brandes (2014); Dagron (1974) 182–7.

¹⁷⁸ Moser (2016b) 445–58 discusses the evidence.

¹⁷⁹ Discussed in detail in Moser (2016b) 447–9.

¹⁸⁰ *PLRE* I: 94 (Araxius), 28 (Agilo), 886 (Thalassius 1) with Bradbury (2004) 268.

¹⁸¹ *PLRE* I: 887 (Thalassius 2) with Bradbury (2004) 269.

¹⁸² *PLRE* I: 414 (Helpidius 2), 150 (Bassianus 2), 726 (Prisca 2). See *PLRE* I: 1141 *stemma* 18.

the East, as is revealed by the problems they encountered when they defended their various properties under Julian.¹⁸³ Bassianus was one of the influential individuals who faced charges in the treason trials under Valens held in Antioch in the winter of 371–2, when his estates were confiscated.¹⁸⁴ However, thanks to his family connections, his son Aristaenetus, a pupil of Libanius at Antioch, became prefect of Constantinople in 392, and was awarded the consulship together with the emperor Honorius in 404.¹⁸⁵

The importance of Thalassius' family is highlighted by an incident that involved his daughter. She was courted by Italicianus, a native of Italy who had been able to secure appointment to an eastern post through his influence at Constantius' court in Milan in 355; he was hence one of the few Italian senators who chose to resettle in the East.¹⁸⁶ Thanks to his noble background, his influence with Constantius and his education – Italicianus was bilingual in Latin and Greek – he was appointed to three prestigious posts in sequence: the prefecture of Egypt in 359, the post of *consularis* in Syria in 360 and the vicariate in Asiana in 361. To advance his status amongst the eastern senatorial aristocracy, he asked for the hand of Thalassius' daughter: marriage could have transformed him, an outsider, into a respected member of a leading senatorial family of Antioch. Frustratingly, it is not known whether Italicianus' request was granted.

The descendants of the praetorian prefect Flavius Philippus were no less successful. His son Simplicius suffered in the treason trials of 358/9 in Scythopolis, when he was exiled for consulting an oracle on his chances of becoming emperor, but he was back at the court of Valens in 365, where Libanius addressed him as a person of great influence.¹⁸⁷ Later descendants, in office in East and West, probably include the urban prefect of Rome Flavius

¹⁸³ I discuss their problems and property in Moser (2016b) 452–8.

¹⁸⁴ *Amm.* 29.1.4–2.28; trials: Lizzi-Testa (2004) 209–33; Potter (2004) 542; Lenski (2002) 218–34.

¹⁸⁵ *PLRE* I: 104 (Aristaenetus 2).

¹⁸⁶ *PLRE* I: 466 (Italicianus) with Bradbury (2004) 251.

¹⁸⁷ *PLRE* I: 843 (Simplicius 4).

The Creation of a Second Senate

Philippus (urban prefect in 391, consul 408), the praetorian prefect (from 404 to 414) Anthemius, who was also consul in 405, and Anthemius' son Fl. Anthemius Isidorus Theophilus, praetorian prefect in 424 and from 435 to 436, when he was made consul. His daughter was married to Procopius, *magister militum per Orientem* in 424, and their son was the western emperor Anthemius (467–72).¹⁸⁸

The places of residence of these senators illuminate the complex nature of this senatorial order that spanned Constantinople and the provinces. The most prominent individuals in the senate maintained luxuriously decorated houses in Constantinople, a phenomenon that began to emerge in the second half of the fourth century AD and which was linked to the display of senatorial status in the city.¹⁸⁹ Their number included the praetorian prefect Musonianus, who retired to Constantinople in 358.¹⁹⁰ But many influential senators chose to reside in the provinces, such as, for instance, Datianus, *comes* of Constantine and principal adviser to Constantius, who became *quaestor* at court in 355 and consul in 358 with Neratius Cerealis and was made *patricius* in 360. Datianus must have been very wealthy indeed, since he built baths, several villas and gardens in and around the Syrian capital, to where he retired. He also donated one of his houses in Antioch to the Church of St Peter in Rome in the mid-350s.¹⁹¹ Datianus' political influence was such that in 363 he followed Jovian's court to Ancyra; prevented by his health from going any further, he wrote a letter to the court, then at Nicaea, in which he recommended the election of Valentinian as emperor.¹⁹²

The most successful of the new senators were those who, like Thalassius, were able to hold high office at court or in a praetorian prefecture, where their sons and relatives could pursue equally outstanding careers. This holds true in

¹⁸⁸ *PLRE* I: 1145 *stemma* 25.

¹⁸⁹ Emergence of *domus* in Constantinople: Machado (2012) 155. On the senatorial *domus* and senatorial lifestyle, see Schlinckert (1996) 132–44.

¹⁹⁰ *PLRE* I: 611 (Strategius Musonianus).

¹⁹¹ *Lib. Pont.* 34.19. On Datianus' identity, see Chapter 7, p. 296.

¹⁹² *PLRE* I: 243 (Datianus 1); Olszaniec (2013) Datianus.

particular for the family of those Constantinopolitan senators who, as trusted supporters of Constantius, were appointed to high office in the West during the Caesarship of Julian, as for instance with the sons of the praetorian prefect Flavius Florentius (prefect of Gaul from 357 to 360 and of Illyricum from 360 to 361). Both seem to have been educated (partly) in Rome. Flavius Florentius' homonymous son became governor in Cilicia and later *consularis* in Syria, and was known to have been well acquainted with Rome, a fact that certainly improved his chances of personal advancement.¹⁹³ His brother Lucianus rose even higher and was *comes Orientis* in 393.¹⁹⁴ The case of Constantius' devoted *quaestor* (in 354) and praetorian prefect of Italy and Africa from 355 to 361, Taurus, is particularly revealing.¹⁹⁵ Two of his sons became powerful praetorian prefects and consuls, as did two of his later descendants who can be traced into the fifth and sixth centuries: his namesake Flavius Taurus, consul in 428 and praetorian prefect and *patricius* in 433–4, and Flavius Taurus Clementinus Armonius Clementius, consul in 513.¹⁹⁶

All in all, the careers of Constantius' first senators in Constantinople reveal that the emperor succeeded in creating a second Roman senatorial aristocracy. The members of the new eastern senatorial aristocracy were just as distinguished and ambitious as their Roman colleagues.¹⁹⁷ They were members of the leading landowning elites in the provinces: as with Roman senators, their wealth, too, was generated on the land. The careers of their descendants further indicate that some of these new senators were opulent enough to establish dynasties in high office, like some of their senatorial colleagues in Rome. In sum, in terms of wealth, ambition and social background,

¹⁹³ *PLRE* I: 364 (Florentius 9). Father: 365 (Florentius 10).

¹⁹⁴ *PLRE* I: 516 (Lucianus 6).

¹⁹⁵ *PLRE* I: 879 (Taurus 3).

¹⁹⁶ Sons of Taurus: *PLRE* I: 128 (Aurelianus 3), 171 (Caesarius 6); and 319 (Eutychianus 5) with important corrections by Cameron et al. (1993) 6–9, 121–6, 149–97, 175–82, 233–6. Further descendants: *PLRE* I: 1146 *stemma* 28.

¹⁹⁷ *Pace* Vanderspoel (1995) 66; Jones (1964) 2: 546–57.

The Creation of a Second Senate

Constantius' new senators were closely modelled on those of Rome.

A Second Roman Senate in Constantinople

Based on this evidence, it is now possible to analyse the character of the new senate. I shall examine its culture and traditions, with the aim of establishing similarities and discerning differences between Rome and its new rival in the East. The traditions of the senate of Constantinople have received little scholarly attention. However, they are useful in establishing its relation with the old senate in Rome.

As was highlighted in the earlier discussion, many of the regulations on entry to the senate as well as the praetorship in Constantinople were identical to those of Rome, or nearly so: note, for instance, the absence of quaestorships or the suffect consulate in Constantinople.¹⁹⁸ In addition, it is possible that in 359 Constantius transferred the traditional judicial functions of the Roman praetor to Constantinople by placing his eastern equivalents in charge of cases concerning the rights of minors (the appointment of guardians and the emancipation of sons from the legal control of their fathers) and those involving the manumission of slaves.¹⁹⁹ However, given that this imperial edict cannot be securely linked to Constantinople rather than Rome – there is no indication of the addressee to identify the senate concerned – this must remain a conjecture, albeit a very likely one, in view of Constantius' plans for the new senate.²⁰⁰ Finally, the adlection procedures in Constantinople were also very similar, if not identical, to those known for Rome.²⁰¹ In short, Roman rules and procedures by and large applied in Constantinople.²⁰²

¹⁹⁸ A tribune of the plebs is, however, attested in Constantinople, perhaps an honorary title only: *CTh* 6.4.17.3 with Löhken (1982) 121.

¹⁹⁹ *CTh* 6.4.16 (359) with Harries (2012) 203.

²⁰⁰ On the legislative status of the two senates, see also Dagron (1974) 136–7.

²⁰¹ Garbarino (1988) 243. Pace Errington (2006) 155–6.

²⁰² Garbarino (1988) 240–4.

Besides, the senate in Constantinople was also a Latin senate. Themistius' speeches and the Greek version of the imperial *Letter of Adlection* that Constantius issued on his behalf might give the impression that this was a Greek-speaking senate, but this is misleading: Constantius' letter was originally written and delivered in Latin in the senate of Constantinople, and will have been sent to the *patres conscripti* of Constantinople who are also mentioned in the earlier *oratio* found in Perge (Chapter 5). It was this version that was circulated by Themistius in the East: when Themistius addressed a letter to the praetorian prefect Strategius Musonianus in late 355 informing him of his adlection to the senate, which also put an end to the prefect's attempts to lure Themistius to Antioch, he attached a copy of the original Latin imperial letter.²⁰³ It was through Strategius Musonianus that Libanius first learned of this Latin letter in Antioch in 355, and he needed a translator to read it.²⁰⁴ Constantius generally addressed the senate in Latin: it is in this language that the laws concerning this institution will have reached the respective proconsul or urban prefect. Valens, too, would address the senate in Latin, as would Mamertinus, the Gallic supporter of Julian who addressed a Latin speech of thanks to the emperor and the senate in 362.²⁰⁵ Given that most if not all of its official business was transacted in Latin, it is to be expected that the senators in Constantinople will have had at least a passive command of Latin: this was expected of provincial governors, a post many of the senators held during their active careers. Also, even Themistius himself will have understood Latin: it has rightly been pointed out that he claimed merely to be unable to deliver highly polished rhetorical speeches in the Latin language, not that he had no command of the 'ruling language' at all.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ Date of Themistius' letter to Musonianus: Fatouros and Krischer (1980) 411–12.

²⁰⁴ Lib. *Ep.* 434, 6, see Errington (2000) 886 n. 23. On the relationship between the Greek version (by Themistius) and the Latin original, see Heather and Moncur (2001) 97 n. 154 and 100 n. 162; Errington (2000) 866 n. 23.

²⁰⁵ Valens: Them. *Or.* 6.71c; Mamertinus: *Pan. Lat.* (3) 11. *PLRE I*: 540 (Mamertinus); Olszianec (2013) Cl. Memertinus and p. 329 below.

²⁰⁶ Ruling language: Them. *Or.* 6.71c–72a, see discussion in Errington (2000) 880 n. 96.

The Creation of a Second Senate

What is more, there is evidence to suggest that the new senate's rituals closely mirrored those of the senate of Rome. In his *gratiarum actio* to Constantius for adlection (Them. *Or.* 2), Themistius provides an illuminating report of the moment when Constantius' letter of adlection was read in the senate. The letter, so Themistius recalled, was read out by an official in a dignified posture with a clear and articulate voice, probably in order to underline the importance of both the moment and the letter's author. More importantly, the calm and reserved behaviour of the official is contrasted by Themistius to the reaction of the senators present. Clad, as was traditional at festivities (so Themistius explains), in togas and wearing exquisite shoes, they gave frequent acclamations while listening to the words of the herald, 'jumping up and shouting thousands of acclamations'.²⁰⁷ The sight of these senators in their fine clothing will have been impressive, not just to their new member Themistius: they will have reminded many of the Roman senate.

We also know that, as was traditional at Rome, the senate in Constantinople was regularly informed about imperial successes, which it had to celebrate in due manner. In a speech written in the winter of 355/6 or 356/7, Themistius furnishes an important detail about the sort of information provided by Constantius to the senators of Constantinople on his western campaigns: the emperor, so Themistius remarked, informed the senators of his other victories (other than those against the usurpers) 'and was prepared to explain them in letters', an act which is then compared to the Classical Athenian custom of generals who were accountable to the Athenian people.²⁰⁸ Constantius showed off in front of the senate and signalled to them his pride in these victories, listing victory monuments and heroic deeds in great number. Based in part on this evidence,

²⁰⁷ Them. *Or.* 2.26c–d. My trans. is based on the German trans. in Leppin and Portmann (1998). The public attire of senators in Constantinople (and Rome) was regulated by imperial legislation: the evidence is discussed in Schlinkert (1996) 147–53 and Löhken (1982) 82–7.

²⁰⁸ Them. *Or.* 4.56d–57a. The Athenian generals in question are Timotheus, Chabrias, and Iphicrates from the fourth century BC, see Leppin and Portmann (1998) 92.

several scholars have argued that Constantius treated the senate of Constantinople with more respect than the senate of Rome. It has also been noted that later in the same speech Themistius describes Constantius' respectful behaviour towards the senate in Constantinople. While all other subjects were to adulate Constantius like a ruler, the senators were expected to treat him as an equal. Constantius is portrayed as a *civilis princeps*, who did not refuse to join their meetings.²⁰⁹ These, so Themistius explains, take place in the senate house that was built by Constantine in the Forum of Constantine, where there is a holy throne for the emperor, and Constantius attended the meeting seated on the throne.²¹⁰ Evidently then, Themistius' claim that the emperor considered himself an equal of the senators must be taken with a pinch of salt: when in the senate, Constantius sat on the throne reserved for the emperor, he was not seated among the simple senators. Nonetheless, his presentation of Constantius as a *civilis princeps* closely mirrors the procedures that are known from Rome, where emperors also acted as *civilis* in their dealings with the senate, suggesting that certain elements of the Roman protocol of imperial seclusion and publicly performed imperial accessibility existed also in Constantinople at the time of Constantius.²¹¹

Finally, the new senate also shared its membership with Rome: as I have argued, by the late 350s at the latest, Constantius had ordered the transfer of senators resident in the East from Rome to Constantinople. This policy powerfully underlined the equality of the two senates.²¹² Truly, and as the emperor had explained in his letter of adlection for Themistius, the honour of being a member in the senate was a Roman honour: ἀξιώματος Ῥωμαϊκοῦ.²¹³

²⁰⁹ Them. *Or.* 4.53b.

²¹⁰ Them. *Or.* 4.53b.

²¹¹ On the Roman protocol, see my discussion of Constantius' entry to Rome in 357 in [Chapter 7, pp. 287–92](#). On the idea of the *civilis princeps* in Constantinople also in later centuries, see Pfeilschifter (2013) 76–122, esp. 99–112; Diefenbach (2002).

²¹² Chastagnol (1992) 261.

²¹³ *Dem. Const.* 21a. For ἀξία as the traditional expression for social rank: Laniado (2002) 160.

The Creation of a Second Senate

In light of this evidence, it comes as no surprise that contemporaries considered the Roman senate the ‘mother institution’ of the new senate in Constantinople: the latter had adopted its institutions, regulations for membership, language, traditions and indeed members.²¹⁴ In order to fulfil its role as a second imperial senate in the East, the senate of Constantinople had to share wherever possible in the traditions of the senate in Rome.²¹⁵

Urban Investments

So far I have discussed Constantius’ efforts to promote the senate of Constantinople in the 350s. In this section I turn to his investments in the urban infrastructure of the city in this period, which were closely aligned with the promotion of the senate. Due to the lack of reliable archaeological material, Constantius’ efforts have to be reconstructed from literary accounts, but fortunately there are several contemporary panegyrics that provide detailed information about the kind of amenities his building programme involved. Given their rhetorical nature, these sources have to be taken with a pinch of salt, but their evidence is still helpful in gauging the nature of Constantius’ efforts and their political context.

I begin with his building works.²¹⁶ The most informative speech is a panegyric by Themistius, delivered to the senate in Constantinople in the mid-350s (Them. *Or.* 4). Themistius’ purpose is to describe Constantius’ loving relationship with Constantinople, as also reflected in his investments in its urban infrastructure. According to Themistius, Constantius greatly embellished the city. He built a large complex that came to be called the Constantian Baths, a colonnade that ran ‘like

²¹⁴ E.g. Lib. *Ep.* 252.

²¹⁵ Garbarino (1988) 240–4. It seems, however, that despite Constantius’ investments, the senate in Constantinople never developed the strong esprit de corps known from Rome, see Näf (1995) 246–55 and Pfeilschifter (2013) 452–510.

²¹⁶ On Constantius’ building programme, see conveniently Henck (2002), and more generally Bardill (2012); Isele (2010) 15–79; Bassett (2004); Berger (1995), (1987); and the classic studies of Mango (1985), (1959), and Janin (1964).

a precious ribbon' through the city and an imperial agora decorated with golden mosaics.²¹⁷

According to Themistius, Constantius was also responsible for much of Constantinople's large collection of statues: 'the best of nature and art is brought to Constantinople from all over the eastern empire, and Constantius erects many statues of himself and his father'.²¹⁸ Constantius imported into the city famous statues from the East, and perhaps one from Rome.²¹⁹ Other statues set up in this period were the one for his praetorian prefect Flavius Philippus and the orator Themistius himself.²²⁰ Themistius claims that Constantius gathered not only the wealth of his contemporaries to Constantinople but also old things which he held in high esteem, possibly a reference to the importation of statues and other works of art (including books?).²²¹ It is known that Constantius ordered the transport of an obelisk from Thebes to Constantinople.²²² Themistius explains that Constantius also assisted Constantinople with food rations and material to heat the baths.²²³ Thanks to the emperor, Constantinopolitans could also boast, among other things, of a theatre with arcades and a beautiful hippodrome, in which Constantius' victories were regularly celebrated with chariot races.²²⁴

Among the most notable features of the city was its harbour: it was situated inside the city's gates and close to the markets.²²⁵ This was distinctive because many other cities, including Rome and Antioch, had no direct access to the sea but were connected to it only by river.²²⁶ The maritime quality

²¹⁷ Them. *Or.* 4.58b–c. The baths are also mentioned in Him. *Or.* 41.7.

²¹⁸ Them. *Or.* 4.52d–53a with Bardill (2012) 34, 66–9; Bassett (2004); Henck (2002) 287–8.

²¹⁹ Henck (2001) 284–93.

²²⁰ Philippus: see pp. 190–3 above. On such statues, see Bauer (2003) 499–502.

²²¹ Them. *Or.* 4.59b–c.

²²² Henck (2001) 288–9.

²²³ Them. *Or.* 4.61c. On the growth of the populace of Constantinople and the infrastructure problems that came with it, see Beck (1973).

²²⁴ Buildings: Them. *Or.* 4.60d; regular celebrations of Constantius' victories: Them. *Or.* 4.58a. The theatre is also mentioned in Him. *Or.* 41.7.

²²⁵ Them. *Or.* 4.60d. On Constantinople's harbours, see Janin (1964) 225–40 and Mango (1985) 37–40.

²²⁶ Leppin and Portmann (1998) 97 n. 89.

The Creation of a Second Senate

of the city was highlighted in its iconography: a major characteristic of the Tyche of Constantinople, *Constantinopolis*, was the prow on which her right foot rested, as on the twin-city motif discussed in [Chapter 4 \(Fig. 4.1\)](#).²²⁷ It will have reminded Constantius' subjects not only of the naval battle that preceded the foundation of this city – the defeat of Licinius at Chrysopolis – but also of its maritime nature. This emphasis on the geographical situation of Constantinople and its harbour is mirrored in literary accounts. In his first preserved panegyric on Constantinople, Himerius provides a full list of the maritime straits and seas that met in Constantinople:

on one side, the Aegean comes up onto your beaches right through the middle of the Hellespont; on the other side, a narrow strait [the Bosphorus] assumes the form of a river, as if contracted so that, through its agency, it can bring close to you, as a gift, the continent [of Asia]. And, in another part of the region, the Cyanean [rocks], which tragedy has called the Symplegades, close off the Propontis and send forth the great [Euxine (Black)] Sea from where they are located.²²⁸

Himerius explains that Constantinople surpassed even Rome in the quality of its harbour facilities: 'merchantmen sail to you from everywhere and from all harbours, in need of no Tiber to get to your fortifications; they put in immediately from the sea and tie their cables right to your walls'.²²⁹

It is likely that Constantius was responsible for improvements in the harbour facilities in the city. For, while the construction of a new harbour, connected to the city by a curved *stoa*, is often attributed to Julian (following Zosimus), this must have been a major building project that is far better situated in the long reign of Constantius than in the short rule of Julian, who perhaps presided over the completion of works that were designed and begun under Constantius.²³⁰ Themistius in his speech is keen to stress the economic aspects of the harbour: he describes the harbour market of Constantinople,

²²⁷ On the Tyche of Constantinople, see Lenski (2015); Dagron (1974); R.-Alföldi (1963); Alföldi (1947); Toynbee (1947); Seck (1898).

²²⁸ *Him. Or.* 62.3 (trans. Penella 2007).

²²⁹ *Him. Or.* 62.5 (trans. Penella 2007).

²³⁰ On this possibility, see Henck (2002) 285.

where commodities and luxuries were delivered from afar and traded, a place bustling with merchants, seafarers, local inhabitants and senators. Themistius mentions wine barrels, pulses and sweets, wood and gold and purple garments; the last two items will have been of particular interest to his audience, the senators in Constantinople.²³¹

Moving on to the religious realm, the construction of new Christian buildings and the introduction of relics greatly improved the city's profile as a centre of Christianity. Constantius modified the mausoleum of Constantine, and arranged the transfer of the relics of Timothy, Andrew and Luke to Constantinople in 356/7, depriving existing Christian centres, including Jerusalem, of some of their splendour, and regaining control over the public use of the memory of Constantine and over the Christian topography of Constantinople against the powerful local bishop Macedonius.²³² The point of orientation was in particular Rome, the city of the apostles Peter and Paul: with the introduction of the three apostles Timothy, Andrew and Luke, Constantinople could now pride herself on an equally important apostolic asset in the Church of the Holy Apostles.²³³ The transformation of a large audience hall built by Constantine into a great church (Hagia Sophia) was completed in 360.²³⁴ The consecration of the Hagia Sophia in turn created the need for a new large assembly in the Augusteion. This was the so-called senate house; inaugurated under Julian, this building is ascribed to him and not to Constantius, under whom the works began.²³⁵ Until its completion senators met in the senate house at the Forum of Constantine, which may

²³¹ Them. *Or.* 4.61a–b.

²³² Control over Christian topography and the bishop Macedonius: Isele (2010) 51–79.

²³³ Mango (1990a), (1990b); Dagron (1974) 401–9. See also Rebenich (2000).

²³⁴ In his rereading of the *Chronicon Paschale* alongside Socrates' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Jonathan Bardill shows that the church, which is also called the Great Church of Constantinople, was begun in 350 or 351 and dedicated on 15 February 360, see Bardill (2004) 54; Mango (1959) 31. *Contra*: Krautheimer (1983), who dates the foundation to Constantine.

²³⁵ John Lyd. *De Mag.* 162–5; Zos. 3.11.3; Malalas 8–12; *Chron. Pasch.* 528.21–529.4 with Berger (2007) 207–8, (1995) 131, (1987) 12–13; Bauer (1996) 148–67.

also have been used as the seat of the municipal council under Constantine and Constantius.²³⁶

Constantius' investments must have transformed Constantinople. In late 361 when Himerius returned to Constantinople, ten years after his move to Athens, to deliver a speech on the new emperor Julian and the city, he was amazed by its beauty and size. According to Himerius the city was almost as big as a continent. What is more, it was situated very usefully between two continents, being at the same time the 'beginning of Europe and also its end, and you have also been allotted the same role in Asia'.²³⁷ A later passage delineates its geographical spread in more detail: Constantinople 'begins to be bathed by the waters that are almost halfway across the straits'. Sea had been turned into land, probably thanks to new embankments on the coast line.²³⁸ Constantinople was a truly impressive sight: 'the city's gold causes people to look now there, now there. The wonders of its craftsmanship attract those who behold them. Its senate house shines forth, its baths are enchanting, its theatres also win people's favour. Everything there is, quite simply, Aphrodite's *kestos*!'²³⁹

Alongside these building efforts, the improvement of educational facilities remained a primary concern. Constantius, moving beyond his earlier investments in the provision of high-class teaching in Constantinople, also commissioned a library with a scriptorium, an imperially funded institution where calligraphers transcribed damaged manuscripts.²⁴⁰ Built probably in the early 350s, and so a seamless continuation of Constantius' earlier investments in the city's educational facilities, the library seems to have opened towards the end of the

²³⁶ Earlier use by city council: e.g. Harries (2012) 122. On the two senate buildings in Constantinople and their decoration, see the concise discussion in Dagron (1974) 137–41. Note that most of the evidence is from later periods and is not very reliable.

²³⁷ Him. Or. 41.4 (trans. Penella 2007).

²³⁸ Him. Or. 41.6 (trans. Penella 2007). New embankments: Mango (2001) 28. For a commentary on the passage, see Völker (2003) 270–1.

²³⁹ Him. Or. 62.7 (trans. Penella 2007).

²⁴⁰ Them. Or. 4.60a–b. Process of transcription: Lemerle (1971) 57–60. Earlier investments: Chapter 4, pp. 135–41 above.

decade.²⁴¹ In 356 Themistius promises his Constantinopolitan audience that they should soon be able to consult the newly transcribed books.²⁴² As regards the works preserved in the new library, Themistius lists the names of Greek poets, philosophers, orators and politicians.²⁴³ No Latin author is named, but Latin works must have been included in the Constantinopolitan collection, as is suggested by the presence of several Latin grammarians in the city. Also, in 372 the prefect of Constantinople Clearchus was ordered to employ four Greek and three Latin *antiquarii* to preserve the manuscripts in the library.²⁴⁴

These were strategic investments. As Constantius stated in his letter to the senators of Constantinople in 355: ‘while it is my heart’s desire that philosophy should shine in every part of the world, I especially wish it to flourish throughout our city’.²⁴⁵ I have already discussed the importance of such interventions for the imperial image of Constantius: by supporting *paideia* in this way he could show himself to be a good emperor, one who understood and welcomed the educational requirements and demands of elite culture.²⁴⁶ In this context belongs Themistius’ involvement in the promotion of

²⁴¹ Early 350: Them. *Or.* 4.61b, where these investments are described as ‘recent’. The library and scriptorium may have been built adjacent to the so-called *στοά βασιλική*: Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 103–4.

²⁴² Them. *Or.* 4. 59b–61d with Vanderspoel (1989); Lemerle (1971) 52–60. On the library, see also Janin (1964) 161–2. It has often been assumed that Constantinople already possessed a library in the time of Constantine, but there is no evidence for it. Lemerle (1971) 52–3 convincingly concludes that the fifty Bibles Constantine ordered to be brought to Constantinople (Eus. *V. Const.* 4.36) are not proof of the foundation of a classical library, or indeed a university; he suggests that they were distributed among the Christian communities and their churches (Lemerle, 1971, 53). McLynn (2004) 237 proposes that the Bibles were intended rather for distribution at court for Christian ritual there (described in Eus. *V. Const.* 4.17, 4.29–32, 4.22.1–2). Henck (2002) has pointed out that the library mentioned in Themistius may not have been a public library but rather a collection of precious books at the disposal of the emperor, but see Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 104.

²⁴³ Them. *Or.* 4. 60b–c. On Themistius’ own contributions to the library: Vanderspoel (1989).

²⁴⁴ *CTH* 14.9.2.

²⁴⁵ *Dem. Const.* 20d (trans. Heather and Moncur 2001).

²⁴⁶ Chapter 4, pp. 135–41 above.

Constantinople as a centre of learning and learned men.²⁴⁷ Themistius was praised by the emperor for providing philosophical teaching and for increasing the number of students in Constantinople.²⁴⁸ Around 359, Themistius toured the East in search of new staff and students for his school, and perhaps at the same time new senators with a strong educational background. It is very likely that this recruitment tour had the approval of Constantius, whose efforts for Constantinople were now complemented by the arrival of several leading scholars from the eastern cities.

In a letter in the senate, the emperor highlighted the importance of philosophers like Themistius for the status of Constantinople.²⁴⁹ In the same letter the emperor had also announced that he aimed to make Constantinople a centre of Greek philosophy.²⁵⁰ The influx of philosophers in the late 350s suggests that Themistius was not the only philosopher to receive imperial support in the city. Several philosophers can be documented there in this period. One of them may be Themistocles, known to have organized regular learned *symposia* in the city.²⁵¹ In addition, the evidence of Themistius, in particular his various defence speeches, implies that there were several rival teachers of philosophy in the city, and that students from Asia Minor but also from ‘Old Greece’, that is Achaea, came to Constantinople to study there instead of at the prestigious universities of those regions.²⁵² In 361 Himerius could then claim that Constantinople had

²⁴⁷ On Themistius’ role in the provision of teaching in Constantinople, see e.g. Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 1–5, 7, 54–6. On Constantius’ interest in the liberal arts and in particular works of literature, see Henck (2001).

²⁴⁸ *Dem. Const.* 21a. After his father-in-law and his father Eugenius, Themistius was the third in his family to teach philosophy in Constantinople, as he notes in *Oration* 21 (from the mid-350s), on which see Penella (2000) 14–16.

²⁴⁹ *Dem. Const.* 21b.

²⁵⁰ *Dem. Const.* 20d.

²⁵¹ *PLRE* I: 894 (Themistocles); *Lib. Ep.* 406, which I discuss in Chapter 4, p. 139.

²⁵² Rival teachers: Heather and Moncur (2001) 3, Penella (2000) 20. Students from Ionia and Greece: Them. *Or.* 23.294. One example is the philosopher from Sicyon who transferred his entire school to Constantinople, where study material composed by Themistius circulated among both these teachers’ students: Them. *Or.* 23.236d–237b, 295b, 296a–b, discussed in Vanderspoel (1995) 84.

not just imported philosophers but also produced new ones.²⁵³ Alongside this, new teachers were acquired for Constantinople: upon the death of the Latin grammarian Euanthius, who wrote a commentary on Terence, a certain Chrestus was sought in Africa – *ex Africa adducitur* – to succeed him in Constantinople in 358.²⁵⁴ Around the same time, the rhetor Harpocraton, of Egyptian origin but a teacher of rhetoric in Antioch who may be the author of a medical treatise, followed Themistius' invitation and transferred his residence to Constantinople.²⁵⁵ Under Constantius, Constantinople became a primary centre of teaching in the East, enabling him to show himself to be a good emperor who cherished learning and merited praise for gathering scholars from the past as well as the present.

This section has investigated Constantius' investments in the amenities of the city in the 350s. It is reasonable to assume that these late investments were motivated by the desire to raise the attractiveness of the city as the seat of the new senate. Through these investments in its urban infrastructure, economic and educational facilities, and its religious credentials Constantinople was adapted to its new role in the empire. That the promotion of the senate and these urban amenities were closely connected is suggested by a speech of Themistius which reveals that this second construction programme of Constantius was launched 'once he [Constantius] had tripled his realm in a legitimate way'.²⁵⁶ This must be 353, following the defeat of the usurper Magnentius in Gaul, when the empire's resources could again be channelled into civic investments. The close interrelation of these investments and the promotion of the senate further suggests that the creation of a second capital in the East was a carefully planned policy, set in place following the reunification of the empire in 353.

²⁵³ Him. *Or.* 62.12.

²⁵⁴ *PLRE I*: 287 (Euanthius 2) with Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 99 and Kaster (1988) 278 no. 54; and *PLRE I*: 201 (Chrestus) with Kaster (1988) 253 no. 27.

²⁵⁵ *PLRE I*: 409 (Harpocraton) with Kaster (1988) 410 no. 226.

²⁵⁶ Them. *Or.* 4.58b.

Legitimizing Revolution

The creation of a new Roman senate in Constantinople and its promotion to a second Rome in the East was a move of great political significance. Henceforth the empire was partitioned into two realms, each with its own senatorial aristocracy and senate. The question of how the development of a second senate in Constantinople was legitimized is thus important. In this last section, I suggest that Constantius pursued a threefold strategy. First, he employed members of the traditional eastern curial elite, including the orator-turned-senator Themistius, to facilitate the acceptance of the new role of Constantinople and its senate in the East. Secondly, Constantius modelled his new senate on that of Rome, which granted the new institution authority and legitimacy. Thirdly, Constantius again drew heavily on the memory of Constantine, as is revealed in Themistius' orations as well as in the imperial letter in support of his adlection to the senate, the *Demegoria Constantii*.

I begin with Constantius' employment of the Greek philosopher Themistius. As has been pointed out by Peter Heather and David Moncur in their excellent introductions to Themistius' Constantinian orations, Themistius played a crucial role in the development of the senate: Constantius' patronage of Themistius manifested the emperor's interest in harnessing the traditional (pagan) curial elites of the eastern provinces for the new senate.²⁵⁷ Constantius' support of the philosopher in the senate was thus part of his policy to draw on the wealthy curial elites. In this enterprise, religion may have been an issue in some cases, but overall, as has been shown, Constantius aimed to assemble the established elites in Constantinople, whatever their religious background, for whom a classical education, *paideia*, was a marker of status.²⁵⁸ It was the learned elites that Constantius sought to attract for the senate of Constantinople, a new socio-political hub in the East.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁷ Heather and Moncur (2001) 1–77, 97–107. See also Errington (2000); Vanderspoel (1995) 51–113.

²⁵⁸ Religion: Heather and Moncur (2001) esp. 57–68.

²⁵⁹ See also Errington (2000) 867.

Indeed, it is important to remember that the establishment of a senate was not just a technical enterprise: in order to function and fulfil its purpose of channelling the political elite of the eastern empire, the new institution had to win acceptance among the established curial elites (and future senators) as much as among those who had already gained senatorial rank through birth or office. The adlection of Themistius, one of Constantinople's most important teachers of philosophy, to the senate in 355 was thus an important political move: it manifested Constantius' intention to develop the senate along traditional lines, while also securing a willing spokesman in the senate who could function as a link between the absent emperor and the new senate. As is well known, Themistius quickly advanced to the position of go-between, channelling communication and information by delivering panegyrics to the senators that reflected imperial ideology and, in turn, bringing current trends in opinion in Constantinople to the attention of the praised emperor.²⁶⁰ But more was necessary: Themistius' involvement in the recruitment scheme in 358/9, and his appointment as one of the judges of praetorship nominations, provided further evidence of the imperial backing for the traditional elite: both revealed that a seat in the Roman senate of Constantinople and traditional values were not irreconcilable but, to the contrary, mutually beneficial.

The career of another distinguished resident of Constantinople who sought entry to the senate reveals that Constantius' claim to be the prime supporter of learning in Constantinople and in the senate was an important argument in his dealings with the senate at the time. The career in question is that of Caesarius, the brother of Gregory of Nazianzus.²⁶¹ Trained as a doctor, Caesarius went to Constantinople in the

²⁶⁰ Heather and Moncur (2001) 29–42. Note also that during his stay in Rome in 357 as representative of the senate of Constantinople Themistius was also employed to soften the blow of the reassignment of the senators of Illyricum to Constantinople, and to establish informal links between the senatorial aristocracy of Rome and that of Constantinople, see pp. 298–308. Praetors: *CTh* 6.4.12.

²⁶¹ *PLRE* I: 169 (Caesarius 2). The career of Caesarius in the senate of Constantinople is also discussed in Dagron (1974) 133, who however is more optimistic about Caesarius' success in obtaining a seat in the senate.

The Creation of a Second Senate

mid- to late 350s, where he quickly made a career for himself.²⁶² In his funeral oration for his deceased brother from late 368, Gregory recalled Caesarius' career in Constantinople: he is reported to have received several official honours from the city. Given his subsequent career, it is likely that he was able to obtain a position as a public doctor of some sort. Caesarius was also able to marry into a noble family of Constantinople. This matchmaking success was perhaps arranged with the assistance of his cousin Theodosia, who had herself married into a wealthy family of Constantinople; she probably assisted Caesarius' career in the city more generally.²⁶³ He was even promised a seat in the senate.²⁶⁴

However, at that time Caesarius had not yet acquired citizenship in Constantinople but was probably still a registered citizen of Nazianzus, his home town, so it was necessary to send an embassy to Constantius in Italy to request his transfer.²⁶⁵ Gregory maintains that the embassy was sent after a public decree, probably of the senate.²⁶⁶ His discussion of the event also provides interesting glimpses into how, according to Gregory, the embassy argued for the grant of Constantinopolitan citizenship to Caesarius. Gregory notes that,

Constantinople was the first city (of the East), and as such was to adorn and honour herself with the first of the learned men – if indeed she was to be the first of the cities and live up to this title – by adding to everything that was said about her the glory of having Caesarius as doctor and as inhabitant (οἰκῆτορ), even though she was already rich, amongst other splendours, in important men as much in philosophy as in the other branches of knowledge.²⁶⁷

There are obvious parallels with the claims made by the emperor himself in the letter of adlection for Themistius from 355, where he declared that he wanted philosophy to shine nowhere as brightly as in Constantinople, and further that

²⁶² Date: Dagron (1974) 133.

²⁶³ On the role of Theodosia, see Calvet-Sebasti (1995) 47–8. On Theodosia, see Bernardi (1984), who discusses the possibility that Theodosia had married into the family of Flavius Ablabius.

²⁶⁴ Greg. Naz. *Or.* 7.8.

²⁶⁵ Greg. Naz. *Or.* 7.8. Prior to inclusion: Dagron (1974) 133.

²⁶⁶ Greg. Naz. *Or.* 7.8. Senate: Dagron (1974) 133.

²⁶⁷ Greg. Naz. *Or.* 7.8. This trans. draws on the French trans. by Calvet-Sebasti (1995).

the inclusion of Themistius was an adornment and upgrading of the city.²⁶⁸ What this suggests is that the senate or at least Caesarius' supporters were quick to use to their own advantage Constantius' policy of promoting Constantinople and its senate through the acquisition of learned men by modelling their case closely on that of Constantius' for Themistius, which made it difficult for the emperor to refuse the petition. It is possible that similar arguments were employed for other new senators too, including the recruits of Themistius, many of whom were men of curial stock who had not yet held office but were good scholars and hence also able to benefit from Constantius' vision of an educated Constantinopolitan senate. Unfortunately it is not known whether Caesarius was granted the citizenship and thus entry to the senate.²⁶⁹ Gregory's attempts to lure his brother back to Nazianzus may indicate a failure, as does a later reference to Caesarius' status as inferior to some of the men he engaged with at court.²⁷⁰

To return to Themistius, even if his role in the new senate and in the recruitment scheme was considerable, and shows that he had established a close relationship with the absent emperor and his court, he was not the only personal link between Constantius and the senators. The ranks of the new senate were filled with former high officials, former or still active provincial governors, *vicarii* and proconsuls, and even praetorian prefects and other senatorial officials from the palatine administration (as Libanius' famous tirade shows). The senate regrouped the leading political elites of the East. And even if many of them lived in the provinces, politically active senators maintained houses in Constantinople, including the former praetorian prefect Strategius Musonianus, who retired there from his post in Antioch in 358. His contacts with the imperial court will have greatly surpassed those of Themistius,

²⁶⁸ *Dem. Const.* 20d–21a. See also Schlange-Schöningen (1995) 7.

²⁶⁹ *Contra*: Calvet-Sebasti (1995) 48: 'sans doute sénateur'; Dagron (1974) 133.

²⁷⁰ *Greg. Naz. Or.* 7.9–10. It is not clear whether Caesarius was appointed physician at court or whether he remained the leading doctor of Constantinople, who was honoured by special imperial grants, perhaps of additional income (on similar lines to Libanius as official teacher of the city, on which see pp. 137–8 above).

The Creation of a Second Senate

as those of several other former officials may have done too. They will have used their former contacts at court to their own advantage or that of fellow senators, and functioned as mediators of imperial power in the senate. As in Rome, there were several senatorial factions in the new senate challenging Themistius and his supporters for influence at court.²⁷¹

This competition for imperial attention was fuelled by the emperor himself, who repeatedly underlined that he was interested in a close relationship with the senators gathered in Constantinople: besides informing them regularly of his exploits, whenever there was a celebration of his rule outside Constantinople the emperor chose a few senators from the list as ambassadors, hoping to involve all senators in the festivities by inviting some.²⁷² Themistius was among those picked in July 357, when he represented Constantinople at Constantius' vicennialian celebrations in Rome (*Them. Or.* 3). The orator was also chosen on another occasion, in the winter of 355/6 or 356/7, but he declined and delivered a panegyric on Constantius and Constantinople in its senate instead (*Them. Or.* 4).²⁷³ A replacement will certainly have been found, and it is to be expected that the replacement was accompanied by some of his most powerful fellow senators, who will have welcomed the opportunity to cultivate established friendships at court.

Secondly and as discussed above, legitimacy was achieved by modelling the new senate on Rome: the adoption of Roman traditions, including dress, ceremonies and terminology, granted the new senate the authority of sharing in this established tradition. The senate of Constantinople was a new senate, but it was a conscious spin-off of the prestigious senate in Rome. This was underlined in particular through the transfer of senators from Rome to Constantinople, which stressed the equality and likeness of the two institutions. The only difference

²⁷¹ Themistius as just one of the leaders of many different interest groups in the senate: Heather and Moncur (2001) 38–9.

²⁷² Exploits: *Them. Or.* 4.56d–57a. List: *Them. Or.* 4.53c. This list is, I suggest, probably the *album* of the senate or a similar overview of the members of the order and their achievements and rank.

²⁷³ Date: Leppin and Portmann (1998) 80–3.

was the scope of their respective authority: Rome could speak for senators domiciled in the West, Constantinople for those in the East. In more than one sense, then, Rome was the ‘mother senate’ of the new senate: it had given Constantinople its traditions, but also its members.²⁷⁴

A third way of legitimizing the capital Constantinople was, perhaps unsurprisingly, the (ab)use of the memory of Constantine. Following a pattern established in the previous decades, Constantius appealed to the motif of dynastic *pietas* between himself and Constantine. In his letter of adlection of 355, Constantius explains that Themistius is to be added to the senate, ‘for thus we might also do what is pleasing to my divine father, by making the council which takes its name from him bloom and flourish with the greatest of good things’.²⁷⁵ What is more, Constantius holds that by adlecting Themistius, ‘I give great honour, I am well aware, to my own father, too, having consecrated to the name of the most godlike man (θειότατος) not a temple or a gymnasium but a good man.’²⁷⁶ In this speech, Constantius’ efforts for Constantinople and in particular its senate were thus still seen as a token of filial piety: Constantius was honouring his father by developing the city. This was no political revolution, but an act of filial piety. A similar argument is made by Themistius in 357 (*Or.* 3). He also claims that in promoting the senate Constantius had executed the plans of his father: while Constantine had liberated Rome and founded Constantinople, Constantius ‘had furnished the city with what it needed, indeed with everything that his father had intended’.²⁷⁷ Constantius’ policy of decorating Constantinople not only with statues of himself but also of his father fits nicely into this context.²⁷⁸

Additional insights can be gained from two speeches of Themistius from the mid-350s, following his inclusion in the

²⁷⁴ Lib. *Ep.* 252.

²⁷⁵ *Dem. Const.* 23b (trans. Heather and Moncur 2001).

²⁷⁶ *Dem. Const.* 23d.

²⁷⁷ Them. *Or.* 3.44b, 47b–c.

²⁷⁸ Them. *Or.* 4.52d. See also the use of the memory of Constantine in Constantius’ dealings with Athanasius: Athan. *Hist. Ar.* 51 with Humphries (1997).

The Creation of a Second Senate

senate. These are imperial panegyrics, delivered in the senate of Constantinople (*Or.* 4) and in the senate of Rome (*Or.* 3), so it is to be expected that they will closely reflect imperial policy and ideology. Thus, in his fourth oration, Themistius reflects on the relationship between the efforts undertaken by Constantine and Constantius respectively to promote the senate of Constantinople. He explains that Constantine was both the father of Constantius and the founder of the senate. Further, the senate is a sibling of Constantius.²⁷⁹ The city even has the same age as the rule of Constantius (both being born in 324).²⁸⁰ Thus, if the senate house is beautified with statues of Constantius and Constantine, this is similar to the situation in Delphi, where people honour both Apollo and his father Zeus.²⁸¹ More interestingly, Themistius implies that it is the senators themselves who uphold this notion of a kinship with Constantius and their foundation under Constantine, his father. The orator claims that when he joined their ranks in 355, he had been told that the senate was the child and fosterling of Constantine and that it was only proper that it honoured Constantius who was his son and their sibling.²⁸² The supposed link of kinship could hence probably work in two directions. On the one hand, Constantius could be relied upon to promote Constantinople, in order not to let down a fellow child of Constantine. On the other hand, Constantinople could be called upon to support Constantius, their brother.

However, it seems that Constantius soon moved on from the notion of being the son of Constantine and brother of the senate to reclaiming his position as the actual founder of the new senate. Thus, sometime thereafter in Rome, speaking in front of Constantius and the Roman senate in spring 357, Themistius calls both Constantine and Constantius the founder of Constantinople. Themistius also claims that in boosting Constantinople, the emperor is fulfilling the plans of

²⁷⁹ Them. *Or.* 4.53a–b. In Them. *Or.* 3.47d, Constantius is described as the brother of the senate, his sister.

²⁸⁰ Them. *Or.* 4.58b.

²⁸¹ Them. *Or.* 4.52c–53a.

²⁸² Them. *Or.* 4.55a.

his father Constantine. In this enterprise Constantius actually engaged in a contest with his father, and he won: in promoting Constantinople and thereby honouring his father, Constantius outdid Constantine. Constantine's benefactions were fewer and ephemeral, those of Constantius more numerous and lasting: 'Your [Constantius'] city differs from your father's in more respects than his did from its predecessor, and has progressed to a true and permanent beauty from an artificial and ephemeral one.'²⁸³ In Constantinople, Constantius had preserved Constantine's inheritance but also increased and improved it on his own account.²⁸⁴ As a result, it was proper to call him the founder of Constantinople.²⁸⁵

Indeed, as Themistius asserts in the same speech, Constantinople's development had been and still was fully dependent on the support of Constantius. First, Constantinople's fate had been hanging in the air following the death of Constantine. Therefore, in view of the fact that many of the tetrarchic residences had been temporary installations and that Constantius was firmly resident in Antioch at the time, Constantinople's future had not looked promising:²⁸⁶ 'when almost all men thought that the city's good fortune would die along with your father, you did not permit or allow this'.²⁸⁷ As a result, more than in the case of any other inhabitant of the empire, the fortune and well-being of the city of Constantinople depended on Constantius. This is also why Constantinople was so afraid of the western usurpations and the danger they represented to its position in the early 350s: it had most to lose, Themistius claimed.²⁸⁸ It is important to remember that even at the time of this speech in 357 Constantinople was still not a fully fledged eastern equivalent of Rome. It was still ruled by a proconsul, and as such lacked one important institution that granted Rome a special place in the administration: an urban

²⁸³ Them. *Or.* 3.47c–d.

²⁸⁴ Them. *Or.* 3.47a.

²⁸⁵ Them. *Or.* 3.43b.

²⁸⁶ Tetrarchic capitals: Heather and Moncur (2001) 133 n. 275 with further refs.

²⁸⁷ Them. *Or.* 3.47a, see also Them. *Or.* 3.47d–48a.

²⁸⁸ Them. *Or.* 4.55c–56d.

The Creation of a Second Senate

prefect with the same status and inappellable judicial authority as the powerful praetorian prefects. As Malcolm Errington has rightly pointed out, Themistius is not confronting the emperor with a particular request. His plea is a more general one: that Constantius will continue his ongoing efforts, even though he is now also in possession of Rome and its senate.²⁸⁹

Thus, in order to justify his promotion of a new senate, Constantius carefully inserted his policies into a discourse of tradition. First, he insisted that the new senate was firmly rooted in the traditional elite values of learned culture and landed wealth. Secondly, he modelled its regulations and traditions closely on the senate of Rome, further underlining the legitimacy of the institution. Finally, Constantius argued that his promotion of city and senate carried on his father's plans for Constantinople. In this light, the establishment of a second senate was presented not as a new policy but a continuation of tradition.

Conclusion

This chapter has re-examined the promotion of Constantinople into a fully fledged equal of Rome in the 350s. I have argued that Constantius introduced a separate eastern *cursus honorum* attached to Constantinople and that through the recruitment of new senators and the redirection of senators in Rome with residence in the East to Constantinople, he forcefully expedited a new senatorial order in the East. Constantius also provided the new institution with the instruments, regulations on entry requirements and election procedures for praetorships that were necessary to manage its diverse membership successfully. This prompted the emergence of a wealthy, well-connected senatorial class in the East. This promotion of Constantinople's senate was paralleled by investments in the city's urban, religious and cultural amenities, suggesting that both were part of a carefully designed plan for the city. Crucially, this new senate was consciously Roman: its traditions were modelled on

²⁸⁹ Errington (2000) 872.

Ruler of Rome and Constantinople (AD 350–361)

those of Rome, and Latin remained an important language of communication. In order to hide the huge impact of the creation of a senatorial aristocracy from among the eastern provincial elites on the social and political structure of the empire, Constantius claimed that his policies were compatible with the cultural and political traditions of the empire, and a part of his father's plans for the city. As so often in history, Constantius drew upon arguments from tradition and political continuity to legitimize the establishment of a new political order, which was made possible by the successful engagement of the eastern elites in the imperial regime.

CHAPTER 7

A ROMAN TRIUMPH

Constantius II in Rome

In 357 Constantius II paid Rome a splendid visit. During his visit he indulged Rome with gold, games, and a large imperial gift. It is often argued that this was an unsuccessful affair. In view of his promotion of Constantinople and his legislation against divination, Constantius is, like Constantine, often believed to have had a conflict-ridden relationship with the old senatorial elites in Rome. Notably, there is an assumption that in his appointments to high office Constantius preferred Christians over pagans, and senators from the East to senators from Rome. He is also accused of promoting the senate in Constantinople and its senators to the detriment of Rome, imposing Constantinopolitan senators on the administration in the West. The failed visit in 357 is then supposed to have prompted the conclusion of the process of establishing a second senate in Constantinople in the subsequent years.¹ In this chapter I challenge this view with a revised appraisal of Constantius' relationship with the old capital between 352 and 361. Throughout, I pay particular attention to Constantius' relations with the senatorial elite in Rome. This is important, as it will allow us to gauge whether it is helpful to consider the senate in Constantinople to be a reaction to imperial dissatisfaction with Rome.

I begin with a short discussion of the arrival of Constantian rule in Rome, which reveals an emperor keen to establish a

¹ Watts (2015) 85–8; Errington (2006) 151–3; Barnes (1989a); von Haehling (1978); Edbrooke (1976); Malcus (1967) 150–3; Piganiol (1972) 109. It has also been argued that the contorniates of 358 were an element of pagan resistance to the Christian policies of Constantius II: Edbrooke (1976) 40–61; Mazzarino (1951) 121–48; Alföldi (1943).

cordial relationship with this city. This is reflected in imperial legislation on matters of concern to senators, in Constantius' appointment policy and in the *Codex Calendar* of 354. This sets the scene for a detailed discussion of Constantius' imperial visit in 357, which is divided into four parts. The first of these, 'Celebrating Constantius in Rome', discusses the senatorial character of his programme in Rome. The next section, 'Roman Religions', then revisits Constantius' policy regarding the cults in Rome, revealing that he considered himself emperor of the traditional pagan cults as well as of the Christian communities in the city. The penultimate section, 'Reassurances in Rome', investigates the role of Constantinople in his dealings with Rome. Finally, 'Surpassing Constantine in Rome' then examines more closely Constantius' use of the Constantinian model in his relationship with Rome. The chapter as a whole reveals an emperor keen to secure and maintain Roman senatorial support for his rule in the West. I suggest that in his dealings with Rome, and in particular during his sojourn in Rome in 357, Constantius acted not as a Christian or Constantinopolitan emperor, but in fact staged himself as a dutiful emperor of Rome and its religions and cults, who in his love for the city even surpassed the great Constantine.

Senatorial Policies

Rome fell to Constantius on 26 September 352, when his first urban prefect Neratius Cerealis took up office. In the following months Cerealis was to establish and consolidate Constantius' hold on the city.² This task was not without its difficulties. Many senators in Rome had taken advantage of the usurpation of Magnentius and the change of regime to further their careers in Rome. Their number included the powerful senators Fabius Titianus, Aurelius Celsinus, Clodius Celsinus Adelphius, and Constantine's close supporter Valerius Proculus: they all served Magnentius as urban prefects. Both Titianus and a certain

² *PLRE* I: 197 (Cerealis 2) and my discussion in Chapter 5, p. 179 above.

Nunechius served as praetorian prefect and, in this capacity, as the new regime's envoys to Constantius during the civil war.³ Later sources claim that on this mission Titianus insulted both Constantius and the memory of his father, and that Constantius showed his imperial magnanimity when he allowed Titianus to depart unharmed.⁴ Titianus, his high-ranking colleagues, and other senators in office under Magnentius may have worried about the consequences of Cerealis' arrival in Rome in 352. They were proved right: Magnentius' senatorial supporters did not go unharmed. Following the usurper's suicide in Autun in mid-353, Constantius ordered a thorough investigation of Magnentius' key supporters, which took place mostly in Gaul. These treason trials were headed by Constantius' *notarius* Paul (the 'Chain'), who was denounced as unduly brutal by Ammianus.⁵ At least one of Magnentius' closest supporters, notably Titianus, had his property confiscated.⁶

Other senators had shown only lukewarm support for the usurper. Some had even supported the revolt of Nepotianus. Nonetheless, overall loyalties seem to have shifted to Constantius only after his victory over Magnentius at the battle of Mursa in late 352. Thereafter many senators fled the city and moved to Illyricum, now under Constantius' control, and an embassy was sent to Constantius to congratulate him on his victory over Magnentius. This difficult embassy was led by Memmius Vitrasius Orfitus, whose career under Constantius followed a diametrically opposite trajectory to that of Titianus:⁷ While Titianus' property was confiscated, Orfitus was accepted as *comes primi ordinis*, and became a key figure of Constantius' rule in Rome.

³ *PLRE* I: 192 (Celsinus 4), (Celsinus 6), 918 (Titianus 6), 747 (Proculus 11), 635 (Nunechius).

⁴ *PLRE* I: 918 (Titianus 6); embassy mentioned by *Jul. Or.* 2.96a; *Them. Or.* 4.62c, 6.80c, 7.97c; *Zos.* 2.49.1–2.

⁵ *Amm.* 14.5. Critique of Ammianus' biased report: Hunt (1998) 23.

⁶ *Jul. Or.* 2.35.96a.

⁷ *Jul. Or.* 1.38d, 48b; 2.97b; *Soc.* 2.32; *Soz.* 4.7; *PLRE* I: 651 (Orfitus 3). The embassy is mentioned in *CIL* VI 1739 + p. 4748 = *LSA* 1441. On the explicit military refs in Orfitus' inscriptions, see Davenport (2015b) 284–5. For a refutation of the claim that Orfitus' *signum* was Honorius, see Tantillo (2014).

Like Orfitus, the city of Rome and its people were handled with care in order to display Constantius' imperial qualities and generosity. One of the first measures of his urban prefect Cerealis was to increase the corn dole for Rome; in a deliberate attempt to display Constantius' *clementia*, the emperor ordered the reassignment to the capital of corn grants formerly made to Campanian cities.⁸ Constantius also showed fatherly concern for the senators. In a letter to Cerealis, Constantius ruled that the senators, members of 'his senate' *curia nostra*, were not to be forced to make excessive contributions to the state, unless required by the emperor himself.⁹

This ruling probably did not concern *munera* such as the praetorships but addressed rather the problem of excessive taxation of senators under Magnentius, who is accused by several sources of carrying out proscriptions and confiscations in Rome and forcing senators to buy imperial property after the suppression of the revolt of Nepotianus.¹⁰ The new imperial ruling will have been reassuring: it made clear that there would be no reprisals at the hand of the urban prefect; only the emperor was allowed to demand additional contributions from senators. Furthermore, the emperor emphasized that he was willing to overrule even his direct representative in the city, the urban prefect in Rome, and so to involve himself in the business of the senate, thereby presenting himself as a traditional father of the Roman senate.¹¹

In the following months Constantius and the senate quickly established a mutually beneficial relationship. Imperial messages communicated in this period reveal that Constantius was keen to establish his hold on Rome. Julian's first oration, a panegyric on Constantius, suggests that in this period Constantius even rehabilitated the memory of his mother

⁸ *Clementia*: *CTh* 9.38.6 (353); corn: *Symm. Rel.* 40.4.

⁹ *CJ* 12.1.5. For the date and addressee of this law, see Schlinkert (1996) 112–13; Dagron (1974) 133 n. 4.

¹⁰ *Them. Or.* 3.42c; *Jul. Or.* 1.27, 30, 48b; *Eutrop.* 10.11.3; and Maraval (2013) 95 with further refs.

¹¹ For earlier imperial legislation on the authority of the urban prefect, see also Moser (2017), 51–2.

Fausta and used it to underline his Roman roots.¹² Written to be delivered during Constantius' vicennialian visit to Rome in 357, the speech repeatedly honoured Fausta, citing her beauty and dynastic connections; this is remarkable, given her erasure from public memory under Constantine.¹³ In his speech Julian provides interesting insights into how Constantius used her memory to consolidate his legitimacy as emperor in the West. Julian notes that Fausta was born and raised in Rome. As a result, Constantius' relationship with Rome was particularly close. With the resurrection of Fausta, Rome could claim to have raised Constantius:

The city that rules over them all was your mother and nurse, and in an auspicious hour delivered to you the imperial sceptre, and therefore asserts her sole title to the honour, and that not merely by resorting to the plea that has prevailed under all the emperors. I mean that, even if men are born elsewhere, they all adopt her constitution and use the laws and customs that she has promulgated, and by that fact become Roman citizens. But her claim is different, namely that she gave your mother birth, rearing her royally and as befitted the offspring who were to be born to her.¹⁴

More interesting still, Julian reports that Constantius had made it his habit to sing the praises of Rome as 'the mother and teacher of virtues'; Julian even holds that praise of the city of Rome was best left to Constantius, who knew how to proclaim it.¹⁵ The reintroduction of the memory of Fausta is remarkable. It reveals the extent to which Constantius was keen to establish his position in Rome. With reference to his mother Fausta, Constantius could claim to be a son of Rome, too, and so in a position to rule in the interest of Rome and its elites.

Constantius' contacts with senatorial Rome were facilitated by the location of his court. With a brief interruption in 353 when Constantius moved north to Arles (Arleate), his court was

¹² Note that Fausta was still *persona non grata* in Libanius' panegyric of 346: Lib. *Or.* 59.30.

¹³ Jul. *Or.* 1.5d, 9d, with Potter (2004) 380. On Julian's *First Oration* and its date, see Tantillo (1997); Straub (1964) 177.

¹⁴ Jul. *Or.* 1.5cd (trans. Wright 1980).

¹⁵ Jul. *Or.* 1.6bc.

stationed in Milan; it was there that he married his second wife Eusebia.¹⁶ The primary reasoning for choosing Milan was certainly that it granted easy access to the Rhine frontier, but the city also had strategic advantages for his dealings with Rome. While observing a respectful distance, Roman senators did not have to travel far to present their petitions to the emperor, and there is evidence of a close and fruitful exchange of favours. First, there is the steep career curve of Ampelius, Constantius' *magister officiorum* in Milan in the mid/late 350s: Ampelius became urban prefect under Valentinian in 371, suggesting that in this office in Milan Ampelius, a man from Antioch, had gained the necessary contacts in Rome to represent the emperor in Rome.¹⁷

Secondly, in this period Constantius also attended to senatorial concerns in Rome. One of the subjects raised at court during this time was senatorial absenteeism (as *CTh* 6.4.4 and 7 from 354, addressed to the praetorian prefect Maecilius Hilarianus and the urban prefect Orfitus reveal). In these laws Constantius made a point of reminding senators of their obligations to serve as praetors and in other offices in Rome and to register their property with the *censuales* (an act called *professio*) so that taxes could be imposed on them according to the size of their property. What this suggests is that the urban prefect Orfitus had been able to coax Constantius into admonishing his senatorial subjects to comply with the demands of their rank, and to exhort his administration to assist Orfitus, the head of the senate, in this task.¹⁸

Contrary to what is often argued, Constantius also furthered Roman senatorial careers. Many were appointed to high office in the administration. In 354 Hilarianus was made praetorian prefect of Italy and Africa. He was not a new senator, but had been proconsul of Africa in 324, consul in 332

¹⁶ Milan: *CTh* 15.14.5 of 3 November 352, which declared several acts of Magnentius to be invalid, including confiscations. Marriage: Maraval (2013) 113 with refs; Arles: *Amm.* 14.8.1.

¹⁷ *PLRE* I: 56 (Publius Ampelius) and Olszaniec (2013) Publius Ampelius.

¹⁸ On the fiscal position of late antique senators, see Moser (2016b). *Contra*: Errington (2006) 151–2 who interprets these laws as an act of imperial disapproval of Rome.

under Constantine and urban prefect in 338.¹⁹ In the same year Vulcacius Rufinus became prefect in Gaul.²⁰ Volusianus *signo* Lampadius was appointed to the praetorian prefecture of Italy. While he probably administered the northern provinces of Italy, Volusianus was attached to the *comitatus* of the emperor, acting as Constantius' ministerial prefect probably well into 355.²¹ In this position he had considerable influence on Constantius' policies, for instance planning the deposing of Gallus. Volusianus was also involved in the removal of Silvanus in Gaul in 355: Ammianus reports that Volusianus forged letters to incriminate Silvanus, for which he was dismissed, tried, but later acquitted.²² Volusianus was of noble descent: his grandfather was probably Constantine's first urban prefect Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, his father Albinus, Constantine's proconsul of Asia and urban prefect in 335–7.²³ Volusianus was also involved in several pagan cults of Rome, being *pater*, *ierophanta*, *profeta Isidis*, *pontifex dei Solis*.²⁴ Finally, in July 355 Egnatius Lollianus *signo* Mavortius, Constantine's former *comes Flaviae* and *comes Orientis*, was made praetorian prefect in Illyricum, a post he held until 356.²⁵ Beneath these prefects, Roman senators were appointed

¹⁹ *PLRE* I: 433 (Hilarianus 5).

²⁰ *PLRE* I: 782 (Rufinus 25).

²¹ *PLRE* I: 978 (Volusianus 5). At court in Italy: Moro (1996) 370; Migl (1994) 131–2. In Italy: Vogler (1979) 129 and also Roux (2014). Note that there is no evidence to suggest, as does *PLRE* I, that Volusianus was stationed in Gaul. The praetorian prefect *PLRE* I: 879 (Taurus 3) is believed to have entered the praetorian prefecture of Italy in April 355 (he was active in Africa previously), but in his discussion Noethlichs (1971) 273–4 has already hinted at the possibility that Taurus may have been in office in Italy already in late 354. If so, Taurus was probably assigned to the dioceses of Africa and suburbicarian Italy (similar to Limenius and Hermogenes in the late 340s), while Volusianus administered the northern parts of Italy as praetorian prefect at the court of Constantius. Vogler (1979) 129 places Taurus in Africa prior to 355. On Limenius and Hermogenes, see Chapter 3, pp. 107–10.

²² *Amm.* 15.5.4–13; see also *Zos.* 2.55.3; on the revolt of Silvanus, described in *Amm.* 15.5; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 14–16; *Eutrop.* 10.13; see Weisweiler (2015b) 108–15; Hunt (1999).

²³ *PLRE* I: 37 (Albinus 14) with Chastagnol (1962) 114–21; *PLRE* I: 976–77 (Volusianus 4). Volusianus' family: *PLRE* I: 1138 *stemma* 13.

²⁴ *ILS* 413. Alan Cameron noted that this list ends with a state cult, which may suggest that Volusianus held these priesthoods early in his life prior to taking up his first governorship, as was the rule for senators of such noble descent: Cameron (2011) 152, 154, 159. At 142–59 he offers a useful discussion of the oriental cults in Rome.

²⁵ *PLRE* I: 512 (Lollianus 5).

to regular provincial governorships in the western administration, as was the tradition.²⁶ In the tradition of his father, Constantius even made a point of introducing two new senatorial provincial governorships (*consulares*) in the provinces of Flaminia and Picenum and Pannonia II, creating further opportunities for advancement to higher office.²⁷ Senatorial ambition thus met a response on the part of the emperor.

Thanks to these investments Constantius soon became the pivot of Roman senatorial culture. The *Codex Calendar* of 354 is a case in point. This is an illustrated calendar of the public festivals in the city of Rome, which includes a list of its consuls, urban prefects, bishops and martyrs. It is hence a unique document for the study of the relationship between Constantius and Rome, and more generally for urban elite culture in the Roman capital in the mid-fourth century AD.²⁸ In her book *On Roman Time. The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the rhythms of urban life in Late Antiquity*, Michele Salzman highlights the political messages contained in this festival calendar of Rome. She notes that the Constantinian dynasty, and in particular Constantine, had a prominent place in it. More importantly for my present interest, the *Codex Calendar* emphasized the legitimacy of Constantius and the illegitimacy of Magnentius (who had been ruler in Rome for two and a half years).²⁹ The circumstances of Constantius' rise to sole rule and his position in Rome were thus regularly commemorated in public events in Rome. These games reminded Rome that Constantius was not only the legitimate emperor of Rome, but had also, like Constantine, liberated the capital from a tyrant.

More interestingly still, the *Codex Calendar* contained an important 'imperial senatorial' message. In 354 Constantius shared the consulship (for the seventh time) with Gallus. Their names thus conclude the most complete and reliable record of Roman consuls to survive, namely the list of consuls included

²⁶ *PLRE* I: 1072–4, 1086–98 with Kuhoff (1983) 50–76, 112–28, 155–9, 171–2. Pace Edbrooke (1976) 41–2, (1975) 413.

²⁷ Kuhoff (1982) 278.

²⁸ Rüpke (2015); Salzman (1990); Bagnall (1987) 47–8; Stern (1953).

²⁹ Salzman (1990) 131–46; see also Benoist (2005) 91–2; Curran (2000) 223–8.

in section VIII of the *Calendar*, which goes back to the time of the kings of Rome.³⁰ Each is represented in an elaborate illustration: Constantius is shown in consular dress seated on a *thronos* with a sceptre in his left hand and scattering coins with his right to represent his liberality (see cover illustration), while Gallus is shown standing, but with sceptre and a small figurine of Victory. More importantly, their images link the illustrations of the months to the consular *fasti*. The two rulers were thus allowed to encapsulate the ideological connotations of consulship: the tradition of the Roman Empire, the glory of Rome, and happiness and prosperity for the future.³¹ This underlines the fact that by 354 at the latest Constantius was the focus of Rome's senatorial world: he furthered their careers, showed fatherly concern over senatorial fiscal matters and styled himself a son and consul of Rome.

This pattern was only slightly modified after the appointment of Julian to the Caesarship in Gaul. On 6 November 355, following the suppression of Silvanus, *magister peditum* in Gaul and a key figure in the military establishment there – around 11 August 355 he had been proclaimed emperor by the troops in Cologne, flagging up the need for an imperial representative in Gaul³² – Constantius raised his cousin Julian to the rank of Caesar in his winter quarters in Milan.³³ On the pattern established with Gallus, Julian's imperial credentials were underlined by his marriage to Helena, the emperor's sister. Together they were sent to Gaul on 1 December, equipped with a booklet full of advice, a gift from Constantius, and Caesar's *Commentarii de bello Gallico*, a gift from Constantius' wife Eusebia.³⁴ As in the case of Gallus, the couple were assigned

³⁰ Salzman (1990) 36.

³¹ Sguaitamatti (2012) 206. On the late Roman consulship: Sguaitamatti (2012); Bagnall et al. (1987) 1–100.

³² Political connotations of the revolt: Hunt (1998) 27–9. The suppression of Silvanus is recounted in Amm. 15.5.15–6.4 and Jul. Or. 1.48c, 2.98d with Hunt (1999); Matthews (1989) 37–9; den Boer (1960).

³³ Amm. 15.8.5–17, 16.10.12.

³⁴ Booklet: Amm. 16.5.3; Jul. Ep. ad Ath. 9.282a; *Commentarii*: Jul. Or. 2.15, 124a; Ep. 28.414c, discussed in Maraval (2013) 137. Constantius advising Julian: see also Aur. Vict. Caes. 42.18. Helena: PLRE I: 409 (Helena 2).

some of Constantius' most experienced supporters, who were to administer Gaul in accordance with Constantius' wishes and uphold his position in particular against the powerful military establishment in Gaul.³⁵ Honoratus, probably a senator from the East who had assisted Gallus as *comes Orientis*, was appointed praetorian prefect in Gaul, and Flavius Taurus, one of Constantius' most important palatine officials in the East, was made prefect of Italy. The appointment of men from the East should not, however, be seen as a move against the senatorial aristocracy of Rome but as part of the complex arrangements for Julian's Caesarship: as in the case of the government of Gallus, the patterns that were put in place were a reaction to the potential threat posed by the presence of Julian as Caesar, not an aversion to Rome.³⁶ This is also suggested by the appointment of Flavius Leontius to the urban prefecture in Rome in 355.³⁷ As I suggested in my earlier discussion of Leontius' career in [Chapter 3](#), there is a possibility that he was a Roman senator: this would explain his excellent command of Latin and his contacts in Rome, which were evidently a prerequisite for appointment to the urban prefecture. With the exception of the posts around Julian, senatorial office in the West remained the privilege of the Roman senatorial aristocracy:³⁸ many Roman senators were able to hold prestigious offices in the Italian and African provinces and in Rome. Regarding the wealthy members of the Roman senate, contemporaries were informed by the anonymous author of the *Expositio totius mundi et gentium* that the senate was composed

³⁵ Hunt (1998) 44–9; Vogler (1979) 93–111; Blockley (1980). For the possibility that Julian was sent to Gaul to keep Constantius' officials from conspiring against him, see Potter (2004) 483–4.

³⁶ *PLRE I*: 438 (Honoratus 2), 879 (Taurus 3). Arguing that it was a move against Rome: Vogler (1979) 141, Edbrooke (1976) 50.

³⁷ *PLRE I*: 438 (Honoratus 2); *PLRE I*: 879 (Taurus 3); *PLRE I*: 503 (Leontius 22) with Migl (1994) 124–32 and my discussion on p. 96 above. Taurus was honoured with a gilded statue on the Forum of Trajan in Rome: *CIL VI* 41226. Julian would later claim his room for manoeuvre was unnecessarily restricted (Jul. *Or. ad Ath.* 280–2c, with Humphries, 2012, on the political agenda of the letter), but see Amm. 16.2–5, 7–8, 11–12. Relationship of Constantius and Julian: Hunt (1998) 49–56; Vogler (1979) 93–111 reaches a more negative verdict.

³⁸ See tables provided in *PLRE I*: 1073–89, 1092–7, *pace* Edbrooke (1976) 61.

of men of great wealth and that ‘if you want to examine them (the senators of Rome) individually, you will find that all have been or will be provincial governors; some could be, yet they do not want this, preferring to enjoy their wealth in all security’.³⁹

The analysis of his visit to Rome in 357 reveals that, following a pattern established by his father Constantine, Constantius was quickly able to establish cordial relations with Rome and to rally senatorial support for his government in the West.

Celebrating Constantius in Rome

In the spring of 357, four years after the final defeat of Magnentius, Constantius made his splendid visit to Rome.⁴⁰ In Rome it was eagerly anticipated: no legitimate ruling emperor had honoured the city with his presence since Constantine’s *vicennalia* in 326.⁴¹ Still, Rome had not been devoid of imperial grandeur: Constantine’s daughter Constantina had taken up residence there sometime between 337 and 351, at which point she married Gallus and moved to Antioch. While in Rome she had overseen imperial building works, including the Church of St Agnes and a monastery later ascribed to Constantine.⁴² In this task she, like Constantine’s mother Helena discussed in [Chapter 1](#), was assisted by members of the palatine administration.⁴³ When Constantina died in Bithynia in 354 (after

³⁹ *Exp. tot. mundi* 55.

⁴⁰ On Constantius’ visit to Rome, see also Humphries (2015), (2007); Maraval (2013) 141–9; Barceló (2004); Gärtner (1994); Klein (1979) 98–115; Edbrooke (1975); Duval (1970); Straub (1964) 175–90.

⁴¹ There is no conclusive evidence for a visit by Constans during his reign: Barnes (1993) 224–6 and Moser (2017), 41–2.

⁴² *PLRE* I: 222 (Constantina 2) with Harries (2014) 209–12, (2012) 266–77; Chenault (2008) 55–6. Buildings: *ILCV* 1768. *Lib. Pont.* 34.23 ascribes the buildings to Constantine. Van Dam (2007) 59–60 follows Krautheimer (1937–80) 1.1: 34–5 in holding that the church was built on Constantius’ orders, while Harries (2014) 209–12 ascribes a more active role to Constantina.

⁴³ *CIL* VI 40790 = *AE* 1995, 195 = *LSA* 1563. The inscription was set up during the joint reign of Constantine II, Constans, and Constantius. After his death and the subsequent *damnatio memoriae* of his name, Constantine II’s name was erased from the inscription, to be replaced with *dominorum nostrorum* in line 6, see commentary by Carlos Machado to *LSA* 1563, and Moser (2016a), 1237–8. Helena: Chapter 1, pp. 34–5.

she and her husband had been ordered to meet Constantius in Illyricum), the emperor instructed that her body be transferred to Rome, where she was interred in the Church of St Agnes. Constantina was thus buried in Rome, again like Helena. Her burial was a statement of the importance of the city as a burial site for imperial women, which emphasized the fact that Rome was and remained an imperial city under the Constantinian dynasty.⁴⁴

Nor was Constantius the first member of his court to visit Rome after the defeat of Magnentius and the establishment of the new political order. His wife Eusebia had travelled to Rome in 354 or 356 to underline the imperial interest in Rome and its elites, and to prepare for the grand imperial visit of 357. During her visit, she had been received by the people and senate of Rome, and had distributed gifts among them, raising the expectations for her husband's visit.⁴⁵

Italy, and in particular the various cities along the Via Flaminia leading to Rome, had readied themselves to welcome the emperor.⁴⁶ On 28 April, the emperor, his wife Eusebia, his sister Helena, and their entourage reached the city. Ammianus described the visit as a truly grand occasion.⁴⁷ Shortly before the gates of Rome, the emperor was greeted by the urban prefect Orfitus and other representatives of the senate.⁴⁸ Constantius did not disappoint: it was a magnificent event. In accordance with the strict protocol of Rome, Constantius' *adventus* led straight to the Forum Romanum. During the

⁴⁴ Preferred burial site for imperial women: Harries (2014), (2012) 277. Note also that when Helena, the sister of Constantina and Constantius, died in Paris in 360, where she resided with her husband Julian, her body was brought to Rome by Julian in 361 to be buried in an imperial mausoleum on the Via Nomentana, the future church of Santa Costanza, named after her sister: *PLRE* I: 409 (Helena 2); involvement of Julian: *Amm.* 21.1.5, *Lib. Or.* 18.179; it is not clear whether the building is a Julianic or a Constantian construction: Varner (2012) 204 n. 137. It is not correct that after 330 imperial burials were the privilege of Constantinople as argued, for instance, by Humphries (2003) 30: (only) the male members of the ruling dynasty were laid to rest in Constantinople (Constantine and Constantius), female members were interred in Rome.

⁴⁵ *Jul. Or.* 3.129b–c.

⁴⁶ See the reconstruction of the baths of Spoleto (Spoletium) in Umbria by Constantius II in the wake of his visit to Rome in 357, *CIL* 11.4781 = *ILS* 739.

⁴⁷ *Amm.* 16.10. Ammianus on Rome: Grig (2012); Kelly (2003); Matthews (1989) 11–13, 231–5.

⁴⁸ *Amm.* 16.10.5.

procession Constantius may have distributed a large amount of gold.⁴⁹ Once in the heart of Rome, he addressed the people from the rostra in the Forum Romanum and staged splendid games of horse-racing in the Circus Maximus.⁵⁰

Like Constantine's visit in 326, Constantius' sojourn in Rome celebrated the Roman senate, its role in the empire and its cultural traditions, and the imperial relationship with it (Chapter 1). Hence Constantius' triumphal parade halted in front of the senate house, which replaced the Capitol as the new focal point of the procession.⁵¹ Once there, Constantius descended from his chariot. Instantly, a static imperial figure was transformed into a *civilis princeps*, an emperor of Rome as *primus inter pares*. In a public display of due respect for the traditions and history of the city, Constantius expressed awe and admiration for the beauty of the Forum, and wherever he looked he was dazzled by the concentration of marvellous sights. The emperor had taken on the role of a Trajanic emperor, mindful of the Roman senate.⁵²

The entry to the senate house was framed by two equestrian statues dedicated by the senate, one to his father and the other to himself (the latter erected under the urban prefect Cerealis in 352). On his way into the senate house, Constantius also passed two statue monuments dedicated to him by two devoted urban prefects, Memmius Orfitus and Flavius Leontius.⁵³ Inside, he made a formal address to the senators.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ His *adventus* was also celebrated in solidi issued in Rome for or after the occasion: *RIC* VIII Rome 287–8. On Constantius' *adventus*, see Humphries (2007) 29–33.

⁵⁰ *Amm.* 16.10.13–14.

⁵¹ On the omission of the Capitol in such *adventus* ceremonies, see Bleckmann (1999a) 51 n. 15; McCormick (1986) 90–1; Duval (1970) 6.

⁵² *Amm.* 16.10.10–13 with Chenault (2008) 92–3; Classen (1988); MacCormack (1981) 42–4. Late Roman emperors in Rome as second Trajans: Schmidt-Hofner (2012) 37–41. Schmidt-Hofner answered the argument of e.g. Klein (1979) 105–6 that Ammianus' report (*Amm.* 16.10) on Constantius' transformation implies an aversion to late Roman ceremonial rulership. On this description of Constantius as a *civilis princeps*, see also Pfeilschifter (2013) 101–2. On Constantine as *civilis princeps* in Rome, see Chapter 1, p. 29.

⁵³ Equestrian statues: *ILS* 698 = *CIL* VI 1141 + 31246 + p. 845 = *LSA* 126; *CIL* VI 1158 = *ILS* 789. Dedications: *PLRE* I: 651 (Orfitus 3) with *CIL* VI 31395 + p. 4345 = *LSA* 1360 and *PLRE* I: 503 (Leontius 22) with *CIL* VI 31397 + p. 4345 = *LSA* 1361 with Humphries (2003) 39–41.

⁵⁴ *Amm.* 16.10.10.

Later the emperor embarked on a tour of the most impressive buildings of Rome, which have been classified into three categories: temples, entertainment venues and monuments of conquest.⁵⁵ While aesthetic pleasures may have played a role, the character of the tour was above all political. Symmachus reports that Constantius was led by ‘the joyful senate’, and when the emperor displayed a keen interest in the historic buildings of Rome the senators gladly explained to him their purpose and history.⁵⁶ Importantly, this tour offered a unique opportunity to individual senators for self-projection both in Rome and at court. Constantius’ promenade through Rome allowed senators including Avianius Symmachus, Flavius Leontius and Vitrasius Orfitus to show the emperor, in front of the assembled senate and the people of Rome, the honorary statues they had erected.⁵⁷

These must have been cherished moments of intimacy with the otherwise distant emperor. It is important that, if Ammianus and Symmachus are to be believed, on this day in April 357 Constantius was particularly generous with his time. Emperor and senators walked in the Forum of Trajan, which had become the primary location for senatorial grandees to display their closeness to the emperor.⁵⁸ Here the most distinguished senators were honoured with statues set up with the permission of the emperor, each statue both a fitting symbol of a senator’s standing in society and, as a token of imperial favour, a ‘dramatic epiphany of imperial power’.⁵⁹ It was a worthy end to a tour glorifying the cordial relationship between the

⁵⁵ Amm. 16.10.14 with Grig (2012) for the deliberate visual aesthetics of Ammianus’ account. Ammianus’ list neglects the Christian buildings of Constantinian Rome discussed in Harries (2012) 276.

⁵⁶ Sym. *Rel.* 3.7. For Constantius’ tour with the senate see Chenault (2008) 98–126; Grig (2012).

⁵⁷ Statue set up by Avianius Symmachus, erected between 337 and 340: *CIL* VI 36954b + p. 4355 = *LSA* 1370; statues set up by Leontius: *CIL* VI 31397 + p. 4345 = *LSA* 1361, *CIL* VI 1160 + p. 4331, and perhaps *CIL* VI 31396 = 40781 = *LSA* 1497; statues set up by Orfitus: *CIL* VI 31395 + p. 4345 = *LSA* 1360, *CIL* VI 1159a + p. 4330 = *CIL* XIV 461 = *LSA* 1654, *CIL* VI 1161 + p. 4431 = *LSA* 1278, *CIL* VI 1162 + p. 4331 = *LSA* 1279. The dedicator of *CIL* VI 31399 = 3790 = *LSA* 1489 is unknown, but may also have been senatorial.

⁵⁸ Schmidt-Hofner (2012).

⁵⁹ Weisweiler (2012a) quotation on p. 323.

emperor and the Roman senate. Again, Constantius expressed due respect and admiration for Rome's beauty.⁶⁰ Constantius' contribution to this exchange of monumental favours was the restoration of the gilded statue for the high-ranking palatine official and consul Eugenius, a key figure in the government of Constans, whose statue in the Forum of Trajan had probably been destroyed under Magnentius.⁶¹ Eugenius was honoured at public expense and with the approval of the senate in gratitude for his life and most devoted loyalty: *uitae et fidelissimae deuotionis gratia*.⁶² The statue was restored under the administration of the Caesar Julian, and it is possible that it was arranged that Constantius would inaugurate the restored monument while in Rome. If so, this would have been a powerful expression of his intention to maintain this relationship in the future.⁶³

Constantius' involvement in the games, too, highlights his willingness to pay respect to the traditions of Rome and the senate. The games were an important part of Roman public culture; they also played a crucial role in the display and self-positioning of Rome's senators.⁶⁴ That Constantius was so keen on the games hence carried an important political message. Also, the emperor did not interfere with the results of the games, as earlier emperors had done: Ammianus notes that he was a fair judge on these occasions (as was expected of a good Roman emperor).⁶⁵ The launch of a special coin series in Rome that celebrated the games and the traditional gods attached to them highlights the importance of such games for the identity of Rome and its senatorial aristocracy and, in turn, the significance of Constantius' participation in them.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Amm. 16.10.15–16 with Kelly (2003) 594–603.

⁶¹ *PLRE* I: 292 (Eugenius 5) with Clauss (1980) 152–3.

⁶² *CIL* VI 1721 + p. 4743 = *LSA* 314 (Machado).

⁶³ Chenault (2008) 125–6.

⁶⁴ For the political dynamics of games in their Roman context and the involvement of senators in their procurement for political purposes: Machado (2010); Harries (2003); Ruggini (2003).

⁶⁵ Political message of Constantius' composure in the circus: Cameron (1976) 157–92, esp. 75–83.

⁶⁶ Contorniates as evidence for games and not for a 'pagan revival': the classic study is Toynbee (1945), refuting Alföldi (1943); for a detailed study of the

On his visit to Rome, and consonant with his policies since 352, Constantius thus presented himself as a ruler respectful of the Roman senate and its past. He addressed the senators in the senate house, admired their city and the monuments they had erected to him, and listened to senatorial concerns. While his tour through Rome will certainly have been carefully staged, it nonetheless allowed senators to meet their emperor and his close retinue face to face; perhaps more importantly still, the tour allowed individual senators to display their closeness to the emperor. This was a clever move, and, it turned out, an effective one: decades later, Roman nobles including Symmachus still recalled his splendid visit.

Roman Religions

During his thirty days in Rome, Constantius had to position himself between the religious traditions of Rome and the demands and expectations of Christian emperorship.⁶⁷ In view of his support of the Christian faith, it is often argued that he had a difficult relationship with the traditional cults of Rome and their adherents, including Roman senators.⁶⁸ The evidence does not support this conclusion. While in Rome Constantius fulfilled the traditional diplomatic requirements of his office as *pontifex maximus* and Roman emperor (and emperor in Rome) regarding the traditional Roman state divinities.⁶⁹ Symmachus writes that Constantius chose the high members of the pagan priesthood himself (from among the leading senatorial families).⁷⁰ Furthermore, Constantius continued imperial financial

contorniates: Mittag (1999). See also Salzman (1990) 215, who points out that the motifs celebrated on these coins reflect similar themes to those in the religiously mixed *Codex Calendar* of 354. For the flourishing of Roman traditions on Constantian coinage in Rome, see also the *SABINAE* and *MONETA AVG(ustus)* medallions minted between 354 and 361: *RIC* VIII Rome 452 and 457–9 respectively.

⁶⁷ Thirty days: Amm. 16.10.20.

⁶⁸ Watts (2015) 85–8; Errington (2006) 151–3; Edbrooke (1976), (1975).

⁶⁹ Priesthoods: Symm. *Rel.* 3.7. I follow the ‘religiously neutral’ interpretation of Hunt (1998) 31. Edbrooke (1976) and Salzman (1990) are more critical of Constantius’ religious policies. On the office of *pontifex maximus* in this period, see also my discussion in Moser (2017) 48.

⁷⁰ Sym. *Rel.* 3.7.

support for the traditional cults, and on his tour in Rome he professed great interest in the temples of Rome, which had been renovated for the occasion.⁷¹

However, in accordance with his legislation against sacrifice, Constantius had ordered the removal of the statue on the Altar of Victory from its traditional symbolic place in the senate house.⁷² On 23 November 353 Constantius had ruled against a practice of traditional religions, nocturnal sacrifices, which had probably been reintroduced by Magnentius.⁷³ Significantly, this was his first law against traditional religious practices (no earlier law is recorded). It was addressed to Cerealis, urban prefect in Rome. The explicit reference to Magnentius indicates that the ruling was prompted by the desire to abolish the usurper's policies and herald a new Constantian age. At the same time, with the law Constantius could also claim to be continuing the policies of his brother Constans, who had issued similar bans.⁷⁴ It was soon followed by similar prohibitions: on 1 December 354 or 356 Constantius' ordered the closure of temples 'in all places and in all cities', hoping that with access forbidden 'all lost souls be denied the opportunity for sin'. People acting against his law and holding (public?) sacrifices were to be subject to confiscation of property, and punishment would also be imposed on provincial governors who failed to prosecute such actions.⁷⁵ On 19 February 356 sacrifice and the worshiping of images (*colere simulacra*) was declared to be punishable with capital punishment.⁷⁶ The interpretation of this and earlier similar legislation is complex and has been discussed in detail elsewhere; most scholars agree that the main issue was

⁷¹ Sym. *Rel.* 3.7. Renovations: Ferri (2015) esp. 142–3 discusses the example of the Salian priesthoods. Note also the interest in the active pagan cults in Rome in the *Exp. tot. mundi* 55 (Vestal Virgins, Jupiter, Sol).

⁷² Removal: Symm. *Rel.* 3.4–6. It was probably already reinstated prior to the reign of Julian: Harries (2012) 278; Croke and Harries (1982) 30–51; a possibility denied in Thompson (2005).

⁷³ *CTh* 16.10.5.

⁷⁴ Continuation of Constans' policies: Barceló (2004) 196. *Contra*: Watts (2015) 85–8, who sees Constantius' legislation as much more restrictive than that of Constans.

⁷⁵ *CTh* 16.10.4 (trans. Project Volterra). For the date, see Noethlichs (1971) 273–4.

⁷⁶ *CTh* 16.10.6.

divination rather than pagan cult practice in general.⁷⁷ But what is important here is that this legislation does not appear to have had much effect in Rome. First, sacrifices continued to be made publicly in Rome even by representatives of the emperor, including for instance the sacrifice to the Dioscuri by Constantius' urban prefect Tertullus in 359.⁷⁸ Also, state cults were largely excluded from this legislation. These and similar laws were not applied to the traditional religion of the state in Rome before the reign of Theodosius I.⁷⁹

Whether or not it was motivated by a strong dislike of traditional cults, Constantius' legislation against sacrifice was certainly a reflection of pressures to prove himself a good Christian emperor in a period in which he was trying to establish unity in the Christian Church, pushing for the acceptance of the Homoean creed.⁸⁰ Several bishops, including the rebellious Nicene bishop Liberius, had refused to subscribe to the profession of faith proposed by the Council of Milan in 355, from which he had absented himself.⁸¹ It has been suggested that several of the supposedly anti-pagan measures, such as the legislation against sacrifice, must be located in this (Christian) context: Constantius was seeking to underline his Christian credentials.⁸² His harsh policy, which had led to Bishop Liberius' being exiled in 355 by the urban prefect

⁷⁷ Maraval (2013) 218–23; Delmaire (2004); Heather and Moncur (2001) 48–57; Carrié and Rousselle (1999) 476–82; Leppin (1999) 466–79; Bradbury (1995), (1994). For Constantius' policy against divination, magic, haruspices and augurs, see also *CTh* 9.16.4, 5 (357); *CTh* 9.16.6 (358). The legislation may also have been motivated by fear of treasonable acts: note that *CTh* 9.16.6 is directed explicitly at members of the imperial *comitatus*. This legislation was not restricted to the West but was also used to root out opponents in the East, as the treason trials in Scythopolis reveal (as reported by Amm. 19.12), see Maraval (2013) 221–2; Leppin (1999) 474–5.

⁷⁸ Sacrifice of Tertullus: Amm. 19.10.4 and *Exp. Tot. Mundi* 55, written after the imperial visit: Rougé (1966) 9–23.

⁷⁹ Harries (2012) 162–5, 207; Curran (2000) 184. For a detailed discussion of the peaceful coexistence of pagans and Christians in Rome under Constantius: Salzman (1990) esp. 193–231. Public priesthoods continued to receive imperial support also in Africa: *CTh* 12.1.46 (358).

⁸⁰ The evidence is discussed in Maraval (2013) 261–80, esp. 265–76; Barnes (1993) 109–43.

⁸¹ Harries (2012) 248, 276; Chenault (2008) 131–3.

⁸² Maraval (2013) 219–20; Leppin (1999) 473–4.

Leontius, seems to have provoked resentment in Rome,⁸³ and later sources report that Liberius' followers made use of the emperor's visits to the circus to voice their plea on the bishop's behalf. Liberius was allowed to return, but only because he had already acceded to Constantius' demands while in exile.⁸⁴ The removal of the Altar of Victory from the senate house should be located in this context, as a move to meet certain Christian expectations rather than as proof of a deliberate imperial anti-pagan policy. Constantius' legislation against certain forms of sacrifice, too, may have been issued in order to appeal to a (Christian or pagan) faction in the senate.

Indeed, it is not clear whether the pagan senators in fact felt offended by Constantius' removal of the Altar of Victory: by the time of Constantius' rule, Christianity had become a notable feature of public life and imperial generosity in Rome.⁸⁵ For instance, Christian churches had become an important marker of imperial presence in the city.⁸⁶ As part of this tradition, Constantius may have financed the colourful mosaics in Santa Costanza, the mausoleum for his sister Constantina.⁸⁷ Constantius was also involved in the construction of (part of)

⁸³ *PLRE* I: 500 (Leontius 5) = 503 (Leontius 22). Leontius' eastern posts as well as his involvement in the removal of Liberius have prompted scholars to conclude that he was a senator from Constantinople, e.g. Barnes (1995) 147; Edbrooke (1976) 45–7; Chastagnol (1962) 147–9 no. 60; but see my discussion in Chapter 3, p. 96. It is also often argued that Leontius was a Christian: Edbrooke (1976) 45–7, 49, but his involvement in the exile of Liberius does not prove that he is a Christian, so his religious affiliation remains unclear.

⁸⁴ Liberius' exile and return: Barnes (1993) 115–18; Edbrooke (1976) 45–7. They are also mentioned in *Lib. Pont.* 37, which holds also that Liberius used Constantina's mausoleum at St Agnes' as a platform to legitimize his position, on which see Harries (2014) 221–2. On the reliability of Theodoret (Theod. 2.14), who holds that senatorial women petitioned Constantius for the return of their bishop, see McLynn (2004) 268–70. Liberius became a powerful magnate in Rome, able to build his own basilica (Basilica Liberiana) which stood on the site of the later Santa Maria Maggiore: Humphries (2007) 38.

⁸⁵ Klein (1979) 109–15.

⁸⁶ Constantinian contributions to the Christian landscape in Rome: Harries (2012) 276. Moser (2017) 46–9 discusses Constans' Christian policies in Rome. Henck (2001) 284 rightly alludes to the possibility that many of Constantius' building efforts were attributed to Constantine, who was not a 'heretical' Arian, on which see also Westall (2015), esp. 242.

⁸⁷ Holloway (2004) 93–104; Curran (2000) 128; Kleinbauer (1988); mosaics: Krautheimer (1987).

the new church of St Peter's and its apse mosaic.⁸⁸ This was evidently an important building project of the new regime, as at least one of his close supporters offered his financial support to the enterprise. A certain Datianus is recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis* as having donated a house he owned in Antioch that generated an (annual) revenue of 240 solidi.⁸⁹ This Datianus is probably to be identified with the wealthy and prominent supporter of Constantius, who was *patricius* and consul in 358.⁹⁰ There is the possibility that Datianus was quaestor at court in Milan from 355 to spring 356,⁹¹ and may in this function have participated in the planning of the project. The involvement in the church-building programme could, like Constantius' legislation against sacrifice, be part of Constantius' Christian agenda: with both policies, he sought either to appease followers or silence opponents in his theological disputes.⁹² In turn, the importance of Constantius' visit to the Christian communities in Rome is illustrated by the likelihood that it prompted the compilation of a list of imperial donations to Rome's churches.⁹³

In Rome Constantius seems to have been keen to avoid religious conflict. His balanced attitude towards Christianity and paganism was exemplified in his candidates for the post of urban prefect. His appointments catered to the expectations of at least two factions within the Roman senate: the adherents of the Christian religion, and those proudly involved in the traditional cults.⁹⁴ If the ascriptions of religious affiliations to these

⁸⁸ Richard Westall has recently argued that St Peter's was a creation of Constantius which was completed by 359, when the consul Junius Bassus was buried there in his sarcophagus, see Westall (2015), esp. 220. However, I find it difficult to believe that the church was built from scratch and completed within less than a decade (between 352 and 359). Mosaics: Krautheimer (1987).

⁸⁹ *Lib. Pont.* 34.19. Datianus' donation was, however, of a relatively modest size compared to other properties mentioned in the same source, for instance to a property in the suburbs of Alexandria producing a revenue of 620 solidi (donated by the emperor, who had received it from Ambrionius: *Lib. Pont.* 34.19).

⁹⁰ Westall (2015) 230–1 with refs, *PLRE I*: 234 (Datianus 1).

⁹¹ *Quaestor* at court in 355/6: Olszaniec (2013) Datianus, esp. 110–17 and p. 253 above.

⁹² Also suggested by Davis (2000) xxx.

⁹³ Davis (2000) xxix–xxx.

⁹⁴ On the possibility of 'religious' senatorial factions, see e.g. Lizzi Testa (2015) on the later decades, and also Moser (2017) 46–9 on the rule of Constans.

prefects that have been proposed are correct, then there was a continuous alternation of Christian and pagan senators in the urban prefecture under Constantius.⁹⁵ Constantius' three last urban prefects were Orfitus (in his second prefecture from 357 to 359), the Christian Junius Bassus, who died in office in 359 (he was buried near the tomb of St Peter), and Tertullus, who may have been a pagan (in office from 359 to 361).⁹⁶ Bassus is of particular importance in this context. When the Christian Bassus died in office in 359, he received an elaborate state funeral, as was traditional for urban prefects who died in office.⁹⁷ His funeral is a powerful example of the pace of the Christianization of the Roman aristocracy, and more importantly, of the relatively unproblematic integration of the new religion into traditional Roman public (state) rituals.⁹⁸ The circumstances of Bassus' burial suggest that the transformation of Rome into a Christian city was well advanced under Constantius, but the change was a gradual one: Bassus' predecessor in office, Orfitus, was a member of several pagan cults (*pontifex deae Vestae*, *pontifex dei solis* and *XVvir*), and he restored the temple of Apollo Sosianus in 355. His successor in office, Tertullus, offered sacrifices in the Temple of Castor at Ostia when the corn ships arrived in the harbour, promising the end of the food shortage in Rome in that year.⁹⁹ The common denominator of his urban prefects was not religion but high birth: Orfitus (father-in-law to the famous author and urban prefect Symmachus), Tertullus and Junius Bassus were scions of powerful senatorial families of Rome.¹⁰⁰ What this

⁹⁵ The prefects are discussed in detail by Chastagnol (1968b) 422–6, who is, however, more optimistic about the reliability of our evidence in his conclusions as regards the religious affiliations of the prefects. In this context, one should note Harries (2012) 277–82, who offers an interesting discussion of the official communication between the prefects and Constantius.

⁹⁶ *PLRE* I: 651 (Orfitus 3), 882 (Tertullus 2) with Chastagnol (1962) 151–3 no. 63; *PLRE* I: 155 (Bassus 15).

⁹⁷ Cameron (2002).

⁹⁸ Pace: Cameron (2011); Salzman (2002); Barnes e.g. (1995), (1994).

⁹⁹ Orfitus' building works: *CIL* VI 45 = *ILS* 3222; Tertullus' sacrifice in Ostia: *Amm.* 19.10.4.

¹⁰⁰ Orfitus is praised for being *genere nobili* (*CIL* VI 1741 = *ILS* 1243), *nobilitate et actibus praecipuo* e.g. on *CIL* VI 1739, and is described by Sym. *Rel.* 34.12 at *posteritas illustris memoriae uiri Orfiti nihil ex illo aliud quam generis insigne*

suggests is that, in his candidates for the office of urban prefect in Rome, his main representative and highest judge in the city, Constantius was interested above all in recruiting Roman nobles: they had the necessary status to act in his name in the empire's old capital, and to smooth his relationships with its aristocracy;¹⁰¹ their religious affiliation was a criterion of secondary importance. In sum, in Rome Constantius, like Constantine and Constans, presented himself as a pious emperor, respectful of the traditional state cults as well as of the demands of Christian emperorship.¹⁰²

Reassurances in Rome

The discussion has highlighted Constantius' cordial relationship with the leading families in the Roman senate. This finding is particularly interesting against the background of the promotion of Constantinople. That will have been an important topic during the visit. As Gavin Kelly has suggested with reference to the visit of 357, 'the tensions over the relative status of the two cities must obviously have been a major factor, and conciliation a central aim'.¹⁰³ I agree that Roman senators will have been interested in Constantius' plans for the city, its new senate, and their relationship to Rome, but there is no evidence that reconciliation was necessary. Rather, Constantius had been carefully crafting his relationship with Rome to dispel worries about Rome's position in the empire.

quaesivit. Tertullus is probably the grandson of *PLRE* I: 883 (Tertullus 6), urban prefect in 307, and son of *PLRE* I: 882 (Tertullus 1), proconsul of Africa in 326. On Bassus: his father was the successful senator *PLRE* I: 154 (Bassus 14). On Flavius Leontius, see my discussion above.

¹⁰¹ In this period Constantius (further) reformed the authority of the prefect in Rome by restricting his authority to Rome, abolishing his right to hear the appeal of cases heard in Rome and in the provinces Sardinia, Sicily, Campania, Calabria, Bruttium and Picenum, and Aemilia and Venetia (but not the other Italian provinces, which were attached to the court of the praetorian prefect of Italy): *CTh* 11.30.27 with Errington (2006) 152 and Chastagnol (1960) 37–42. This concentration of power seems to have produced the desired results and was emulated in Constantinople in 361 at the latest: *CTh* 1.6.1.

¹⁰² Constans in Rome: Moser (2017).

¹⁰³ Kelly (2003) 598.

Thus, during his visit in 357, the emperor set out to remove any remaining doubts in Rome.¹⁰⁴ First, he underlined that Rome was the only city in the empire that offered an appropriate stage for his imperial *vicennalia*: as one of his panegyrists explained, Rome was the summit of the world, the city that ruled the other cities of the empire.¹⁰⁵ In this connection it may be noted that as part of the celebration of his *vicennalia* in Rome Constantius received embassies from all major cities in the empire congratulating him on the glorious occasion. Several contemporary letters reveal that his court had previously urged eastern cities to send delegations to Rome.¹⁰⁶ Antioch was represented by Letoius, a rich *curialis* of the city, its neighbouring city Cyrrhus by a certain Pelagius, a prominent *curialis*.¹⁰⁷

The emperor concurrently laid out his plans for the new city and reassured Rome of its unique place in the empire. On the relationship of Constantinople and Rome, one speech is of particular importance, which was delivered during one of the festive gatherings of the emperor, his entourage, Roman senators and other dignitaries from all over the empire. The speech was delivered by the representative of Constantinople, the orator Themistius. It is a key source for understanding Constantius' Constantinopolitan policies in Rome. It suggests that the promotion of Constantinople was certainly discussed in detail behind closed doors in the senate house or at court during Constantius' visit, and that speeches like that of Themistius aimed to reassure the Roman senators both of their priority and of the esteem Constantius had for them and their support for his rule.

¹⁰⁴ Klein (1979) 106–9.

¹⁰⁵ Them. *Or.* 3.41b–42b, see Straub (1964) 177

¹⁰⁶ Lib. *Ep.* 559; Dagron (1968) 20–1. One of the palatine officials involved in this imperial convocation was Eugnomonius, a chancellery official, perhaps *magister epistularum Graecarum* in 357–8, who had had been a fellow student of Libanius in Athens. Eugnomonius had drafted the Greek letter sent to Antioch, from where he received several letters (with demands): Bradbury (2004) 60–1.

¹⁰⁷ *PLRE* I: 504 (Letoius) and Lib. *Or.* 5.50–9 with Bradbury (2004) 59–61; *PLRE* I: 686 (Pelagius 1) and Lib. *Or.* 95 with Bradbury (2004) 158–9.

Themistius explains that in her superior position, highlighted by Constantius' decision to celebrate his imperial anniversary there, Rome shared power with the new capital of the East, Constantinople, which was grateful for her past development under Constantius and not ashamed to grant Rome the first rank. Themistius also notes that, like Constantius, Constantinople acknowledged that Rome was entitled to occupy the first position among the cities in the reunited empire. Themistius is keen to stress that this restructuring of power was in fact only proper, as the fates of the two cities were intrinsically connected. Rome had given Constantine to the world, who founded Constantinople; Constantinople, in turn, had sent Constantius to liberate Rome from Magnentius, who is accused of having 'hacked at the senate and filled Tiber's undefiled waters with slaughterings and pollution'.¹⁰⁸ In light of these facts Themistius proposes that in future Rome, the 'metropolis of triumphs', together with Constantinople, who shares in Rome's fortune and its name, and the emperor Constantius would all join in a harmonious dance to rule in peace and harmony over the Roman Empire.¹⁰⁹ Here Themistius seems to be referring to Constantius' plan to separate the senatorial order into two independent realms, one attached to Constantinople and one to Rome: if Constantinople was to take over certain responsibilities in the East (notably by regrouping the senators with residency in the East), Rome was to assemble the senators in the West and be considered the 'senior' senate.¹¹⁰

Another imperial panegyric, Julian's *First Oration* on Constantius, sent to Rome to be read aloud during the festivities there, also discussed the role of Rome and Constantinople in Constantius' empire. Julian's line on the relationship of the two capitals is very similar to that of Themistius, suggesting that Constantius was keen to have this point explained to his Roman public. Julian also stresses Constantius' close personal relationship with the city. According to Julian, Constantine

¹⁰⁸ Them. *Or.* 3.43c (trans. Heather and Moncur 2001).

¹⁰⁹ Them. *Or.* 3.42a–44b.

¹¹⁰ On the separation of the senatorial order in 357, see [Chapter 6](#), pp. 227–32.

‘founded and gave his name to a city that as far surpasses all others as it is itself inferior to Rome; and to come second to Rome seems to me a much greater honour than to be counted first and foremost of all cities beside’.¹¹¹ The superiority of Rome is also stressed in his passage about Fausta, and Rome being the birthplace of Fausta and hence, in a way, of Constantius: as Constantius’ nominal place of birth, Rome eclipses Constantinople. As Julian writes: ‘then again, the city on the Bosphorus which is named after the family of the Constantii,¹¹² though she does not assert that she is your native place, but acknowledges that she became your adopted land by your father’s act, will think she is cheated of her rights if any orator should try to deprive her of at least this claim to kinship’.¹¹³

Themistius also reassures the senators that Constantius ruled in their interest and was concerned about their well-being. He suggests that Constantius’ concern for Rome had revealed itself in the liberation of Rome from the tyrant Magnentius. Themistius portrays Constantius as the protector not only of Rome, but also of its senate.¹¹⁴ Themistius praises Constantius for liberating Rome from a barbarian even though he had not been forced to act: ‘when you had the chance to live quietly in peace after doubling the portion of your dominion’ (that is after the incorporation of the prefecture of Illyricum into his realm when Vetranio was deposed), ‘you neither ignored nor neglected the freedom of the city nor allowed it to pass away, but held your invincible hand over it’. Indeed, the very act made Constantius a true Roman emperor: ‘it is because of this that we can address you as Emperor of the Romans and do not lie when we write and proclaim these august and ancient titles – *Caesar, Autocrator, Consul* on

¹¹¹ Jul. *Or.* 1.8c (trans. Wright 1980). Note also that the *Exp. tot. mundi* 55 calls Rome ‘the greatest and most distinguished and royal city which displays her value by her name and is called Rome’.

¹¹² Note the replacement of Constantine by Constantius, which I discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, pp. 192–3, 272–5.

¹¹³ Jul. *Or.* 1.5d (trans. Wright 1980).

¹¹⁴ Them. *Or.* 3.43.

many occasions, Father of the Senate'.¹¹⁵ In this remarkable passage Themistius casts Constantius as a traditional Roman emperor (*Caesar, Autocrator*) and, most importantly, as 'Father of the Senate'. The senators must have been flattered to hear these words delivered by a representative of the new senate in Constantinople, in a speech delivered in Greek, in front of Constantius, proud emperor of Rome. Themistius' Constantius is the same figure reflected in imperial legislation and in Ammianus' and Symmachus' accounts discussed above, namely an emperor keen to display himself publicly (or, in the case of Themistius, to have himself displayed)¹¹⁶ as an emperor of Rome enjoying a cordial relationship with the Roman elite.

Is this harmonious picture undermined by the last sections of Themistius' panegyric? In its present form Themistius' third oration also contains several sections celebrating Constantius' efforts on behalf of Constantinople.¹¹⁷ Constantius, Themistius claimed, was the 'founder' of Constantinople: the city 'who takes her name from your father but is in reality yours rather than your father's'.¹¹⁸ It is through him that she now rules in second place (after Rome).¹¹⁹ Through him the city was, 'in her entirety, [his] crown and votive offering'.¹²⁰ Constantius had given to Constantinople her 'lasting beauty', now securely ahead of other eastern cities.¹²¹ This was possible also through its new senate, to which senators now 'flocked from all side voluntarily and on their own initiative', it being their own desire and enthusiasm which leads them to Constantinople.¹²²

The Constantinopolitan passage has long puzzled historians, as it is thought it would have represented a direct offence to the Roman audience, if it was really delivered. The continuing

¹¹⁵ Them. *Or.* 3.43d (trans. after Heather and Moncur 2001, italics are mine).

¹¹⁶ On the complex nature of panegyric, see Rees (2012), (2002); Whitby (1998); MacCormack (1975).

¹¹⁷ Them. *Or.* 3, see Moncur and Heather (2001) 114–35; Leppin and Portmann (1998) 68–79; Vanderspoel (1995) 100–3.

¹¹⁸ Founder: Them. *Or.* 3.43b; more Constantius' city: Them. *Or.* 3.40c (trans. Heather and Moncur 2001).

¹¹⁹ Them. *Or.* 3.41c.

¹²⁰ Them. *Or.* 3.41a.

¹²¹ Them. *Or.* 3.47a–d.

¹²² Them. *Or.* 3.48a–b.

success of Themistius would then imply that Constantius II supported (or at least tolerated) the official representative of Constantinople, his adlect senator Themistius, jeopardizing his carefully established relationship with Rome. John Vanderspoel recently proposed a possible solution to the problem. He suggested that the discussion of Constantinople from 46d down to 48d was not part of the speech delivered in Rome but was added later prior to delivery and publication in Constantinople, so the original speech concluded at 46c with a philosophical point, as was typical of the final sentences of Themistius' speeches.¹²³

However, there is another possibility. I suggest that the Constantinopolitan passage was added to the original speech at the demand of the emperor for delivery in Rome. Considering that Constantius sought to maintain his cordial relationship with Rome, it would certainly have been polite to inform the senators of his future policies for Constantinople, which were also announced in a large medallion minted in Rome, while at the same time reassuring them of his ongoing support for Rome and its interests.¹²⁴ The medallion with the impressive weight of 20.20g of gold shows Constantinople as a capital: the city is seated on an elaborately decorated throne, with a sceptre in her left hand and a globe with a Victory in her right.¹²⁵ Rather than representing an affront to Rome, this may have been issued to praise Rome's unique status in the empire: only she could be the model for a new capital in the East.

Surpassing Constantine in Rome

Before resuming his military responsibilities further north, Constantius erected an impressive and rare imperial gift to Rome.¹²⁶ A gigantic Egyptian obelisk was brought to the city and set up in the Circus Maximus in the middle of the race track opposite the imperial box, where it would be viewed by

¹²³ Vanderspoel (2012) 231.

¹²⁴ The coins seem to be alluded to by Themistius: Them. *Or.* 3.42a.

¹²⁵ *RIC* VIII Rome 285.

¹²⁶ Constantius' German campaigns: Harries (2012) 223–4.

the populace of Rome each time it gathered in the circus.¹²⁷ Rome was now the only city to possess two obelisks in its circus, and the erection of a second such monument was a confirmation of Rome's uniqueness.¹²⁸ Its long inscription has been recorded, revealing a further important aspect of Constantius' visit to Rome: his insistence on surpassing Constantine in his love for Rome.

In the inscription on its base, Constantius explained that the monument was a visual expression of his high esteem for the city he had saved from Magnentius: *haec gloria dudum auctori seruata suo cu[m] caede tyranni redditur*.¹²⁹ The reference to the tyrant is important. Its wording matched that of the equestrian statue that was dedicated in 353 to the victorious and triumphant emperor, restorer of the city of Rome and the world and extinguisher of the pestilential tyranny (of Magnentius): *uictori ac triumphatori ... restitutori urbis Romae adque orb(is) et extinctori pestiferae tyrannidis*.¹³⁰ At the time, to coincide with the celebration of Constantius' *tricennalia* (as Caesar) in late 353 in Arles, the senate had honoured Constantius with an equestrian statue set up close to that of his father Constantine in front of the senate house on the Forum Romanum. Like the triumphal Arch of Constantine, this equestrian statue was a public profession of loyalty to the new emperor, and also retrospectively legitimized Constantius' victory against a Roman emperor in a civil war.¹³¹ The

¹²⁷ Amm. 17.4.13, see Humphrey (1986) 288 and Henck (2001) 281–2. Maraval (2013) 144–5 with refs on the possible religious interpretations of the monument. It is possible that Constantius was responsible for the erection of an obelisk in Arles to commemorate his *vicennalia*: Van Dam (2007) 64–5; Henck (2001) 300. *Contra*: Charron and Heijmans (2001) 157 who suggest Constantine erected the obelisk in Arles.

¹²⁸ Henck (2001) 282. So, even if there may be a suggestion by Julian that Constantius had had plans to erect a similar obelisk in Constantinople (it was erected in 390 under Theodosius), Rome would still have been superior in the number of obelisks. On the rivalry between the two capitals over building works, see now Grig (2012); Ward-Perkins (2012).

¹²⁹ *CIL* VI 1163 = *ILS* 736 ll. 20–2 with Humphries (2007) 36, (2003) 38–9.

¹³⁰ *CIL* VI 1158 = *ILS* 789.

¹³¹ Humphries (2007) 33–7.

commemoration of the defeat of Magnentius thus bolstered Constantius' claim to be a legitimate emperor of Rome.¹³²

That the defeat of Magnentius was an important aspect of the imperial visit in 357 is also highlighted by written sources. The same notion can be found in Themistius' and Julian's panegyrics, and probably in very many of the other speeches given during the visit: both included an elaborate passage on Constantius' liberation of Rome. Further, a fragment of Eunapius on Constantius' visit in 357 even suggests that Constantius' great victories were being re-enacted in the circus during the visit, with the possibility that the battle of Mursa was among the events staged.¹³³ If so, the presence of the Persian prince Hormisdas, leader of Constantius' cavalry in the battle, will have given a particularly vivid character to the scene.¹³⁴ Ammianus, by contrast, was critical of Constantius' celebration of the defeat of Magnentius. He accuses Constantius of celebrating a triumphal entry into Rome even though his only major victory had been that over Magnentius, in a civil war.¹³⁵ However, this is a particularly critical view of Constantius' successes against Magnentius, and Ammianus' agenda may have been to criticize not so much Constantius as the policies of Theodosius I, who entered Rome in 389, around the time when Ammianus was writing his *Res Gestae*.¹³⁶

Constantius' defeat of Magnentius was trumpeted in Rome not because it was his only major victory, but because it allowed him to compare himself favourably to Constantine.¹³⁷ There is ample evidence that with his visit Constantius intended to evoke this comparison. Like his father in 326, in 357 Constantius came

¹³² Victory over Magnentius as a way to stress Constantius' legitimacy: Humphries (2015), (2003).

¹³³ Woods (1999).

¹³⁴ Hormisdas: Kelly (2003) 600–2; Mosig-Walburg (2000); Cameron (1989); Edbrooke (1975).

¹³⁵ Amm. 16.10.1–4.

¹³⁶ Hidden agenda of Ammianus in this passage: Schmidt-Hofner (2012) 38 n. 29, who rightly notes that caution is needed when dealing with the judgemental comments of Ammianus on Constantius, as they reflect Ammianus' criticism of Theodosius.

¹³⁷ For Constantius' important victories over barbarian tribes along the Rhine: Them. Or. 3.41d–42a.

to Rome to solemnize his twentieth imperial anniversary as Augustus.¹³⁸ Besides celebrating his *vicennalia*, Constantius was also, again like his father during his vicennialian visit, consul (for the ninth time).¹³⁹ However, unlike his father, Constantius is not known to have minted consular coinage in the other mints of the empire but only in Rome.¹⁴⁰ This suggests that the consular celebrations of 357 were limited to Rome, elevating Rome to her rightful position as the city of the (senatorial) traditions of the empire. It also supported Constantius' message that he surpassed his father in his love for Rome.

Finally, like Constantine, Constantius had also liberated Rome from a tyrant. Hence Themistius explains that Constantius had demonstrated that he was prepared to go to war with a formidable enemy to defend Constantine's succession and the empire he had established.¹⁴¹ Other sources confirm that Constantius' decision to confront Magnentius was also explained with reference to dynastic loyalty, both to Constans, whose murder had to be avenged, and to Constantine, whose accomplishments had to be defended.¹⁴² Constantius' continuation of Constans' religious policies may be a reflection of this policy of emphasizing dynastic continuity. It is certainly in this context that Constantius' building of a mausoleum for Constans and the reinstallation of a statue for his official Eugenius in the Forum of Trajan are to be located.¹⁴³

The comparison with Constantine was also helpful in distinguishing Constantius' achievements as more memorable than those of his forebears. On the base of his obelisk Constantius promoted the idea that he was engaged in a contest with his father Constantine regarding their love for Rome:¹⁴⁴

¹³⁸ Klein (1979) 99–103. I discuss Constantine's visit to Rome in 326 in [Chapter 1](#).

¹³⁹ On the complex political context of his visit: Salzman (2000) 218–22; Vanderspoel (1995) 101 n. 138; McCormick (1986) 40–1; Duval (1970).

¹⁴⁰ *RIC VIII Rome* 297–8 with Bagnall (1987) 248.

¹⁴¹ Them. *Or.* 3.43a.

¹⁴² Athan. *hHist. Ar.* 51, 69; Jul. *Or.* 1.35d–37b, 3.59.d–60b; Them. *Or.* 2.33d–34a, 3.43.a; Zos. 2.44.3.

¹⁴³ Mausoleum: Chapter 5, p. 210. Eugenius: see my discussion above.

¹⁴⁴ For a similar favourable comparison of Constantius' efforts, this time on behalf of Constantinople, with those of Constantine, see Them. *Or.* 3.47a–48b, discussed in [Chapter 6](#), pp. 272–5.

Constantius claimed that his father had planned to send the obelisk instead to Constantinople.¹⁴⁵ According to Ammianus, Constantine had in fact had Rome in mind.¹⁴⁶ He reports that this obelisk had originally adorned the Temple of Ammon in Thebes, whence it was shipped, on Constantine's orders, to Alexandria. There it remained for over twenty years, possibly because the death of Constantine in 337 interrupted its further transport to its destination.¹⁴⁷ Both suggestions are plausible, but what is more important in this context is that Constantius, when erecting the obelisk in one of the most prominent locations in the city, made a point of stressing that he surpassed his father in his love for Rome and for its senators.¹⁴⁸

The ongoing commemoration of the victory over Magnentius fits nicely into this context. In contemporary panegyric the defeat of the usurper was characterized as more glorious than that of his father against Maxentius. While Themistius stresses only the parallels between the two in his panegyric delivered in Rome in 357, Julian's words are much bolder. According to Julian, Constantius II, ruler over the entire Roman Empire, had not imitated his father, but surpassed him: Constantius had erected a marker of his victory that was grander than that of his father, and he had also fought an enemy who was more dangerous, more tyrannical, and much younger (and hence fitter) than the enemy of Constantine.¹⁴⁹ In other words, as in Constantinople, so in Rome Constantius (ab)used the memory of his father to further his own position in the city. The message was that, while Constantine had liberated Rome from Maxentius, he had set Rome free from an even more formidable tyrant, Magnentius. In Themistius, Constantius' victory over Magnentius is thus not an *imitatio Constantini*

¹⁴⁵ *CIL* VI.1.1163 = *ILS* 736.

¹⁴⁶ *Amm.* 17.4.18–23 with Kelly (2008) 225–30.

¹⁴⁷ Largest obelisk: Humphrey (1986) 288. Constantine and Alexandria: *Amm.* 16.4.14, 17.3.13.

¹⁴⁸ Fowden (1987). Note that when the obelisk was re-erected for Pope Sixtus V in the late sixteenth century, on its new inscription centre stage was given to Constantine, who had converted the Roman world to Catholicism (it was claimed), while reducing Constantius to the mere executor of his plans, see Westall (2015) 234–7.

¹⁴⁹ In civil war: *Jul. Or.* 1.37b

but a *superatio* of the paternal model.¹⁵⁰ The same idea rings through in Julian's first oration, his first panegyric on Constantius. Here, too, Constantius was not a second but a better Constantine.¹⁵¹

This argument was necessary because Constantius' refusal to accept Magnentius as a co-ruler had disrupted the lives of many senators, who had had to decide which camp to join.¹⁵² It was particularly important because, at the time, Julian's successes in Gaul may have made it necessary to underline Constantius' military prowess and his legitimacy. That Constantius was wary of his Caesar is suggested by the fact that Julian had not been allowed to accompany Constantius to Rome; Helena's presence sufficed to give the impression of imperial concord.¹⁵³ Also, in his speech to the senate, Constantius had Themistius note that he was the sole survivor of the Constantinian dynasty, even though Julian too belonged to it.¹⁵⁴ The ongoing commemoration of his victory over Magnentius was thus also an argument about the rightfulness of Constantius' rule, and the obelisk a permanent display of Constantius' love for Rome and his overruling authority in the city.¹⁵⁵

Rome, it seems, was keen to believe its emperor and to support his military campaigns.¹⁵⁶ Constantius in turn used his visit to Rome to confirm his willingness to continue their successful collaboration also in the new era of Constantinople. This is suggested by a passage in Julian's oration for the occasion, which details Constantius' generous policies towards Rome. Julian notes that Constantius treated his friends and

¹⁵⁰ Them. *Or.* 3.44a–b. *Superatio* not *imitatio*: Bleckmann (1999a) 63–4. The same notion is employed in Themistius' description of Constantius' efforts for Constantinople, Them. *Or.* 3.46d–48b.

¹⁵¹ Constantius as surpassing his father more generally: Jul. *Or.* 1.9b, 10a.

¹⁵² On (Roman) senatorial literary engagements with the civil war with Magnentius, see Bleckmann (1999a) 69–96, who discusses the poem of Proba, which he dates to a post-Constantian period, as well as the narratives contained in Zosimus and Zonaras, both based on earlier Roman senatorial engagements with the conflict.

¹⁵³ Duval (1970) 5.

¹⁵⁴ Them. *Or.* 3.45b.

¹⁵⁵ Magnentius: Humphries (2003) 38–41; obelisk: Henck (2001) 281–3.

¹⁵⁶ Statue-monument to Constantius on his victory over the Quadi and the Sarmatians: *CIL* VI 1164 + p. 4331 = *LSA* 1280. On the campaigns, see Amm. 17.12.15 with Blockley (1998) 422; Mócsy (1974) 286–8.

in particular the senators of Rome with the greatest respect, safeguarding their property and wealth; and that Constantius had granted amnesty to the great majority of Magnentius' supporters after the battle of Mursa. The emperor is said to have restored to them the property that had been taken from them by the usurper and allowed them to return to their homes, and had welcomed refugees from Italy who had fled Magnentius.¹⁵⁷ Most notably, Constantius, so Julian explains, had been willing to forgive his former enemies. Hence in late 351 Constantius had welcomed to his camp in Pannonia the most honourable and wealthy Roman senators who had until then supported Magnentius.¹⁵⁸ In addition and more generally, Constantius was keen to restore property to its owners and had made the wealth of the rich more secure, adding new wealth to it.¹⁵⁹ He was generous with honours, enjoyed seeing his friends revel in wealth, and was happy to appoint his friends governors of cities or provinces, with the appropriate honours attached.¹⁶⁰ Constantius also retains friends in their offices for as long as possible; he ensures that they profit from their wealth and that their family or friends inherit their fortunes.¹⁶¹ All in all, Julian's Constantius is an emperor keen to benefit his friends and supporters.

It seems that Constantius' call was heard. A fine example of the mutually supportive relationship between this emperor and the senatorial aristocracy is the eminent career of L. Aurelius Avianius Symmachus *signo* Phosphorius, who rose to become a leading member of the Roman senate under Constantius.¹⁶² His early career was already briefly addressed in [Chapter 3](#), where I discussed the two statues Avianius erected to Constantius in Rome and Ostia in his office as *praefectus annonae* in 337–40.¹⁶³ Avianius, who also acted as *pontifex*

¹⁵⁷ Jul. Or. 1.38b.

¹⁵⁸ Jul. Or. 1.48b, 2.97b–c.

¹⁵⁹ Jul. Or. 1.43a–b, 44b, 2.97a–b.

¹⁶⁰ Jul. Or. 1.44d, 2.97a–b.

¹⁶¹ Jul. Or. 1.46b–c.

¹⁶² *PLRE* I: 863 (Symmachus 3) with Salzman and Roberts (2012) xviii–xx, who offer a revised discussion of his career.

¹⁶³ For the statues, see [Chapter 3](#), pp. 85–6.

maior and *quindecimvir*, later occupied the prestigious post of *vicarius urbis Romae*. In 361 he was sent as envoy to the court of Constantius, probably to assure the emperor that Rome remained loyal to him and opposed Julian (the senate had just refused Julian's appeal for senatorial support for his usurpation against Constantius). In this role he may already have been acting as *princeps senatus*, an honour that gave him the right to speak first in senatorial deliberations.¹⁶⁴ His career inscriptions record that he held this position for many years, during which he repeatedly, and successfully, headed senatorial embassies.¹⁶⁵ Avianius' political influence derived partly from his family alliances: he was married to a daughter of Titianus, ex-praetorian prefect of Gaul under Constans and Magnentius' first urban prefect.¹⁶⁶ Given Titianus' involvement in the government of Magnentius, it is remarkable that Avianius prospered under Constantius. Not so, however, under Julian, who, it seems, did not trust Avianius, perhaps because of his loyalty to Constantius. Hence, even though Avianius was received by Julian at Naissus in early 361 on his return from Antioch,¹⁶⁷ it was only in 364 under Valentinian that he rose to the position of urban prefect.

Avianius' embassy to Antioch in early 361 is powerful counter-evidence against arguments for a rupture between Rome and Constantius: until Constantius' death in May 361, the Roman senate remained loyally attached to the founder of a second senate in Constantinople, Constantius. When Julian demanded the support of the senate, his plea was harshly rejected.¹⁶⁸ In addition, Avianius' career also offers a case-study in the relative ease with which Roman senators regarded the foundation of a new senate in Constantinople. Probably during his journey to Antioch in 361, Avianius made the acquaintance of Libanius. He later wrote to the rhetor to inquire about the

¹⁶⁴ *CIL* VI 1698 = *ILS* 1257 with Lizzi Testa (2004) 342 on the position of *princeps senatus*.

¹⁶⁵ *Amm.* 21.12.24.

¹⁶⁶ *PLRE* I: 918 (Titianus 6).

¹⁶⁷ *Amm.* 21.12.24.

¹⁶⁸ *Amm.* 21.10.7. On this passage, see also Lizzi Testa (2009).

possibility of sending his son Aurelius to study with Libanius in Antioch.¹⁶⁹ Further, for his efforts as urban prefect, Avianius was honoured by the emperors Valens and Valentinian with a golden statue in the Forum of Trajan in Rome and, with imperial permission, also in Constantinople: *quorum perenne iudicium tanto muneri hoc quoque addidit ut alteram statuam pari splendore etiam apud Constantinopolim conlocaret*.¹⁷⁰ Clearly, Constantinople and its senatorial circles were not off-limits to Rome. Perhaps more importantly, Constantius, so Avianius' career suggests, had been able also to dispel concerns about the rise of Constantinople, not least during his visit to Rome in 357, when the emperor underlined the primacy of Rome and its senate over Constantinople. The continuing loyalty of Rome and its senators to Constantius suggests that his policy was successful: the large obelisk, which displayed both the emperor's military achievement and his devotion to Rome, had convinced Rome of the advantages of collaboration with the absent emperor, in particular given the high risk of a new usurpation and instability in the West.¹⁷¹

Conclusion

This chapter has investigated Constantius' relationship with Rome and the Roman senate between 352 and 361, after the defeat of the western usurper Magnentius. Constantius established a mutually beneficial relationship with Rome. In order for this to be possible while promoting Constantinople, Constantius displayed his qualities as emperor of Rome, granting privileges, creating new posts and appointing senators to high office. Constantius became and, as in particular the *Codex Calendar* reveals, was cherished as the focal point of Roman senatorial culture. The elevation of Julian did not result in a major modification of this relationship. Constantius used

¹⁶⁹ Lib. *Ep.* 1004 with Lizzi Testa (2004) 444–6.

¹⁷⁰ *CIL* VI 1698 + p. 4737 = *ILS* 1257 with Weisweiler (2012a) 314–16; Bauer (2003) 500–1.

¹⁷¹ On the danger of usurpations for the success of Roman senatorial families: Weisweiler (2015b) 131–3; Bleckmann (1999a) 91–6.

Ruler of Rome and Constantinople (AD 350–361)

his visit to Rome in 357 to reassure Rome of its leading role among the cities of his empire and of his love and respect for the city, its elites and cults. After all, so Constantius insisted, this city had given birth to his mother. Most notably, the emperor explained that in his love for Rome he even surpassed his father Constantine. It seems that Rome was willing to believe him, and when Julian turned to them for support he was rebuked. Overall, and despite some setbacks (notably the loss of the senators resident in the eastern provinces, as well as access to the senatorial posts in these provinces), the Roman nobility fared well under this emperor. Looking at its new obelisk, the senators seem to have concluded that their future lay not with Julian but with Constantius, who had furthered their careers and said he loved them more than even Constantine had done. Constantius' empire, then, was truly one between Rome and Constantinople.

CONCLUSION

This book set out to investigate the integration of the eastern curial elites into the imperial system in the first half of the fourth century AD and its effects on the exercise of imperial rule under the Constantinian dynasty. In the course of this examination it became clear that an imperial need for a more modern senate, so often postulated as a ground for the creation of a new senate in Constantinople, is in no way an adequate explanation for this development, given the quality of imperial relations with the old senatorial elite in Rome, the strong continuities in the social composition and institutional structures of the senatorial order, and the importance of the Roman senate as a source of legitimacy for imperial rule in this period. An overarching question thus presented itself: why were the eastern curial elites drawn into a second senate in Constantinople during a period of intense collaboration between emperors and leading senators in Rome? How was this achieved, how was it legitimized and what were its effects on the shape of the empire? And, finally, what were its functions in the imperial system? By tracing a number of key themes that run throughout the different periods of the reigns of Constantine and Constantius II, short- and long-term patterns become clear: we have seen how the short-term results of Magnentius' usurpation in 350 impacted on the ways the social elites of the Roman Empire were organized within the imperial system, and hence on the shape of the late Roman Empire and on imperial rule itself.

The first chapter examined the background against which the politics and consequences of creating a second senatorial class

Conclusion

in the East were played out, drawing on evidence from Rome about the imperial relationship to the Roman senate under the emperor Constantine as reflected in coinage, inscriptions, legal evidence, administrative changes, and personal networks, in order to build up a picture of the functions and expectations of the imperial connection to the Roman senate in this period. It became clear that Constantine took a particular interest in his relationship with Rome and its senate throughout his reign, including when he was absent from Rome. Crucially, as my study of Constantine's appointments has revealed, the relationship was played out above all in active senatorial participation in government, most notably in the provincial administration not only in Italy but also in regions that were key to maintaining Constantine's position in Africa, Greece, and, after 324, also in the provinces east of Thrace (Oriens). This was achieved not least by a rise in the number of offices available to be occupied by senators in Constantine's administration, such as the creation of more provincial governorships by upgrading equestrian posts to senatorial rank. While scholarship has focused on the creation of provincial governorships in Italy or the promotion of equestrian posts at court (most notably the praetorian prefecture), I investigated in particular the situation in the East, where Constantine revived several prominent senatorial offices. These include the proconsulship of Achaëa, revived around 320, and several traditional senatorial posts in the provinces of the prefecture of Oriens, namely the proconsulship of Asia and high-ranking offices in Syria, reinstated after 324, all of which offer evidence of the continuous involvement of leading senators from Rome in Constantine's government throughout the empire. These posts may not have required the expert knowledge demanded by some offices at court, but Constantine's reliance on Roman senators reflects his interest in attracting their social prestige to benefit his cause, while the strategic employment of senators in the conflict with the emperor Licinius in the East reveals that the involvement of Roman senators was a way to bolster the legitimacy of Constantine against this rival, whose eastern power-base left him unable to draw on these senators

Conclusion

as a source of political support. This collaboration in government was underpinned by a continuous exchange of honours and favours and by marriage links between the imperial house and Roman senatorial families, as well as by the residence of female members of the imperial house in Rome.

Chapter 2 then revisited some of the key assumptions in current historiography about the nature of Constantine's regime-building policies in the East after the defeat of Licinius and the foundation of Constantinople in 324. These concern the recruitment of senators from among the eastern curial elites, the creation of a second senate in Constantinople and the reorganization of the social elites in a new hierarchy of honours that depended on the emperor in the reformed order of *comites*. The available evidence did not support the argument that a senate was created in Constantinople between 324 and 337, or that men of senatorial rank were included in the municipal council there at that time; the sources are inconclusive and often contradictory. The claim that Constantine introduced praetorships to the city is, however, clearly problematic and not supported by the evidence. Interesting findings emerged from the re-examination of a passage in the *Life of Constantine* by the bishop Eusebius (Eus. *V. Const.* 4.1), which has been cited as indicating a widespread conferment of senatorial rank in the eastern provinces. A close reading of the passage revealed that this interpretation rests on a mistranslation of a crucial part of the text, which in fact concerns the conferment of equestrian rather than senatorial titles. As I argued in that connection, this aligns well with numismatic evidence from Nicomedia, where Constantine issued a large golden coin in honour of the Roman knight (*EQVES* or *EQVIS ROMANVS*). Against the background of Eusebius' evidence, I suggested that the coin was issued to advertise equestrian honours among the provincial elites, in the hope of encouraging them to apply for these titles, and so to join the imperial system of honours and privileges and support Constantine's regime in the East.

This conclusion is strengthened by a reform of the equestrian ranks in this period, which upgraded the rank of *vir*

Conclusion

perfectissimus, and so created a new honour for elites ambitious to distinguish themselves from their peers in the provinces, a policy reflected also in the passage of Eusebius. In synthesis, my proposal is that new supporters among the eastern elites were integrated into the imperial system by granting them perfectissimate governorships or honorary titles, but not senatorial rank. This finding is in accord with the results established in [Chapter 1](#), where I focused on the appointment of Roman senators in the senatorial provincial administration in the East. The conclusion presents itself that in the East the traditional social hierarchy between Roman senators and provincial elites was respected: while senatorial honours were granted to senators from Rome, eastern elites were rewarded with equestrian honours for their participation in the imperial system. Importantly, the study of the few known *comites* of Constantine from this period revealed that the traditional hierarchy was respected also in the newly reformed order of imperial companions, despite the possibilities it in principle granted for fostering social advancement across the existing social classes. The established senatorial elite of Rome fared well under Constantine: he expanded their legal privileges and created new opportunities for advancement by young senators, increasing the ways successful families could maintain their pre-eminence over generations; on the other hand, there is only limited evidence for the rise of new senators under Constantine.¹ The increased integration of the Roman senators into the imperial system enlarged the senators' scope for patronage and personal power networks, and many of Constantine's senatorial supporters were able to establish powerful networks of patronage, to be remembered by later generations as the most successful senators of their time.² Overall, my discussion of

¹ As noted also by Jones (1964) 1: 106. The more general statement about the generous inclusion of new men from the provinces under Constantine by the panegyrist Nazarius in his speech from 321 (*Pan. Lat.* 4[10].35.1–2, discussed in Chastagnol (1992) 237–8 and Weisweiler (2015a) 26–30), needs to be treated with care, in particular in view of Eusebius' comment about Constantine's restricted granting of senatorial rank (*Eus. V. Const.* 4.1, discussed in detail in [Chapter 2](#), pp. 48–51).

² *Sym. Ep.* 1.1–10 with Salzman and Roberts (2012) and Lizzi Testa (2009) 120–3.

Conclusion

imperial relations with Rome under Constantine also calls for a more nuanced understanding of the Constantinian reforms, including the reduction in the importance of some minor senatorial offices, such as the quaestorship and the suffect consulate and the upgrading of equestrian offices to senatorial rank,³ and of the desired effects of these reforms on the senatorial aristocracy of Rome.

In this way, the two chapters of the first part of the book revealed that traditional claims that Constantine's defeat of Licinius led to a major change in the imperial relationship with the senate of Rome and the creation of a new, alternative elite in Constantinople are overstated. My investigation of his relationship with Rome in this period has instead shown that the Roman senate remained an important pillar of Constantine's imperial system, and that it was crucial also for the maintenance of his position in the East, as is revealed not least by the appointments of Roman senators in Greece, Asia and Syria. The prosopographical study of Constantine's senatorial administration in the East has thus yielded important findings about the state of the empire under Constantine, and reveals that he used the reunification of the empire in 324 to restore the *cursus honorum* linked to the senate in Rome, so the eastern provinces were integrated into the traditional political hierarchy of the Roman Empire and Roman senators ranked above eastern curial elites, who were rewarded with equestrian titles.

Both the senatorial order and the *cursus honorum* attached to Rome were thus undivided at the death of Constantine in 337, when his son and successor Constantius II became emperor of the East. In contrast to his father, Constantius had to rule the East in a shared empire, alongside his brother co-emperors Constantine II, who died in 340, and Constans, murdered in a coup in 350. Constantius' responses to this challenge were examined in the two chapters of **Part II**, devoted to Constantius' early reign from 337 to 350. **Chapter 3** continued the study of the senatorial elites and investigated the careers and

³ E.g. Salway (2015); Stein (1968) 121.

Conclusion

backgrounds of Constantius' senatorial officials between 337 and 350. Previous studies have argued that Constantius ruled through men from the East, but some have also noted that some Roman senators did hold office in the East. My investigation of the attested senatorial provincial governors under Constantius revealed that both these claims are well founded: Constantius continued his father's policy of employing leading senators from Rome in high office in the East; he even appointed them praetorian prefects. However, in the lower ranking senatorial administration around Syria, several senators from eastern curial families can be documented, an indication of the success of local families in taking advantage of the imperial presence in Antioch. The findings suggested that Constantius continued to advertise his rule and the advantages it offered to senators in Rome, but that, after several years of close collaboration between 337 and 342, the presence of established senators in the East diminished. It would appear that Constantius' extremely senator-friendly appointment policies in the West⁴ made it difficult to maintain senators' interest in holding office in the East. That said, after Constantine's reforms imperial rule in the East had again become more dependent on senatorial support from Rome, and it seems that Constantius' policies may have been consciously devised to work against Constantius in their competition for senatorial support in Rome. Constantius thus discovered the difficulties of ruling the eastern provinces in a shared empire.

Based on these results, [Chapter 4](#) then explored the nature of Constantius' rule in the East. Constantius' court was based at Antioch, whose elites were able to profit from the continuous presence of the emperor and his administration. Antioch also witnessed many glamorous celebrations of Constantius' rule and military successes. Nonetheless, Constantius also invested greatly in the promotion of Constantinople in this period, raising the question of what that city's role was in his empire. The discussion revealed that Constantinople was transformed into a constant symbol of Constantius' imperial glory as the

⁴ A point also discussed in Moser (2017) 42–6.

Conclusion

rightful successor of Constantine. For instance, in late 337 Constantius issued a coin commemorating the death of his father that portrayed Constantine as having died as ‘Father of the Emperors’, whereas in reality Constantine had died without having publicly declared his successor(s). Later, during the shared rule with Constans from 340 to 350, the image of Constantinople itself came to stand for Constantius and his position as senior Augustus. Such a use of the Tyche of the city was possible also thanks to Constantius’ continued investment in the city of his father. Constantius raised the rank of the city’s governor and made him a proconsul; he also invested heavily in the city’s educational facilities. Praise for the city of Constantinople (*Stadtlob*) thus soon became praise of the emperor (*Kaiserlob*).

So what was the role of Constantinople? Its importance was rooted in its close relationship to Constantine, whose memory was deployed by Constantius to boost his own position as emperor, a fact that is powerfully revealed by several coin series issued between 342 and 347 that commemorate Constantine in order to glorify Constantius. With its Constantinian heritage, Constantinople proclaimed the glory of the eastern Roman emperor Constantius against his brother Constans in the West, who had easier access to Rome and the legitimacy derived from the support of the leading families in the Roman senate. The so-called praetorships, games given by magistrates of the urban council of Constantinople, were an important aspect of this policy. Contemporary legal evidence (*CTh* 6.4.5 and 6) calls these officials ‘praetors’, a term known only from Rome, where it designated the magistracy by which new senators entered the senate. However, claims that the law is evidence of praetorian games on the model of Rome in Constantinople, that is, games attached to a senate rather than to a municipal council, were shown to be without substance. The sums of money involved and other evidence for the nature of the game-giving body suggest that it was a municipal council, not a senate. This conclusion aligns neatly with the prosopographical evidence from [Chapter 3](#), where no basis was found for the claim that a substantial senatorial class in the

Conclusion

East emerged during the 340s. These games were established in Constantinople in order to stage annual performances of Constantius' imperial credentials. Constantinople, then, did not become the seat of a new senate but of Constantius' policy of using the notion of dynastic legitimacy to bolster his claims against his co-emperors in the West.

In early 350 Constans was murdered in a coup led by his general Magnentius, who was able to draw on several important senators to secure the official backing of the senate in Rome. Constantius moved west and in March 351 declared war on Magnentius. The first chapter of [Part III](#), which studied Constantius' rule between 350 and 361, investigated the senatorial policies put in place by Constantius in response to this imperial crisis. Study of the senatorial officials in the eastern administration documented the presence of new senators from the East in posts formerly held by Roman senators, such as the proconsulship of Achaëa or that of Constantinople. The remaining Roman senators were by contrast employed in crucial posts at the court of the Caesar Gallus in Antioch; these continued to answer to the absent Constantius, who made use of their social prestige to bolster his position. Additional measures, such as the creation of exceptionally large administrative units, were put in place to maintain a stable government in the East during Constantius' continued absence. One of the problems Constantius faced was that he could not draw on political support from the senate of Rome, and so he lacked official legitimacy in waging war on Magnentius. As I showed, in this situation Constantius promoted the council in Constantinople to function as a second senate; senators in the East assembled there, and so were able to give his decision the legitimacy that otherwise only the senate in Rome could bestow. This was revealed by an imperial letter, from a dossier of inscriptions attached to several honorary statues to Constantius' praetorian prefect Flavius Philippus. In this letter the senate of Constantinople is given primacy over the municipal councils in the East, and its members are addressed as Conscript Fathers (*patres conscripti*) – a clear indication of the rise in rank and function of the council in Constantinople.

Conclusion

The discussion of this letter alongside other evidence from the public honours for Philippus suggested that the promotion of Constantinople may have been linked to Constantius' imperial image, and that membership in the senate was an expression of loyalty to his cause.

Together with the two chapters of [Part II, Chapter 5](#) thus powerfully revealed the difficulties and dangers of imperial rule in the East in a shared empire. In a post-Constantinian empire, where imperial legitimacy again drew heavily on the political support of the Roman senate, a usurpation in Rome left Constantius in need of an alternative source of political support, an emergency situation which seems to have prompted the promotion of the council of Constantinople to the status of a second senate. The following two chapters of [Part III](#) then examined the long-term consequences of this short-term decision after the reunification of the empire under Constantius' rule in 353. [Chapter 6](#) investigated the measures taken to conclude the integration of the eastern elites into a second senatorial aristocracy in the East by promoting a second senate in Constantinople. The study of the regulations concerning the praetorships in Constantinople as they are preserved in imperial legislation suggested that entry to the senate was carefully regulated. Its membership was composed of many high-ranking officials, provincial governors, *vicarii*, proconsuls and also praetorian prefects. Equality with Rome was achieved when senators with roots in the eastern provinces in Illyricum and the prefecture of Oriens were reassigned to Constantinople in 357. Alongside this, many new senators were created in the eastern provinces through the institution of a large number of new senatorial governorships from 355 onwards, which completed the establishment of a fully fledged eastern *cursus honorum* attached to Constantinople. More importantly, the correlation between the enlargement of the ranks of the senate and the expansion of the senatorial administration revealed that these two processes were closely connected, and that the new senate was created as an officeholding aristocracy. These results go against the grain of the widely held view that many senators rose through the imperial bureaucracy, through the

Conclusion

lower offices in the administration, a view which rests heavily on the biased literary sources of the period. Officeholding was expensive, which explains why, with a few notable exceptions, social advancement remained restricted, and why the existing social hierarchy of the curial classes was reproduced in the senatorial hierarchy in Constantinople. Some of the senatorial families in Constantinople were less ancient than the established families in Rome, yet they reveal similar career aspirations, personal networks and financial interests. In order to allow this senatorial culture to thrive in Constantinople, Constantius further improved the urban amenities and the religious and educational facilities of the city. The promotion of Constantinople was completed in 359 when an urban prefect was introduced to the city, and in analogy to Rome this office became the highpoint of a senatorial career in Constantinople. My discussion suggested furthermore that both the new senate and its membership were closely modelled on Rome in its rules of membership, officeholding and political traditions. The chapter concluded with an investigation of the policies put in place to justify the creation of a senate in Constantinople, including the Roman character of the institution and reference to the memory of Constantine.

The final chapter, [Chapter 7](#), then examined Constantius' relationship with the senate in Rome in this period. It became clear that arguments for an estrangement on grounds of religion or the foundation of Constantinople are unfounded. Constantius' relationship to Rome closely followed the pattern established by Constantine, and Constantius received the political support of the senate in return for further legal privileges, appointment to high office (several Roman senators became praetorian prefects under Constantius) and balanced religious policies in Rome.⁵ The discussion of the senatorial culture in Rome revealed that Constantius quickly became the centre of the senatorial world in Rome after the city's recapture in 352, perhaps also thanks to his policy of using the memory of his

⁵ The intricacy of religious policies in Rome is explored in more detail in Moser (2017) esp. 46–9.

Conclusion

mother Fausta and her Roman descent as a way to underline his knowledge of and respect for the city. The imperial visit in 357, famously described by Ammianus,⁶ served to strengthen the political alliance between Constantius and the Roman senate. On that occasion, Constantius' good deeds towards Rome, his liberation of it from the tyrant Magnentius, were compared to those of his father Constantine, and his Roman audience was assured that Constantius surpassed his father in his love for Rome, that Rome ranked first among all the cities in the empire, including Constantinople, and that Constantius remained the 'Father of the Senate' of Rome. Henceforth, the empire was divided into two senatorial realms, but Rome was still the more important Roman city, and its senators remained the summit of the social elites of the empire.

These findings about the integration of the eastern elites into the imperial system and their function in the empire have several important implications for our understanding of the role of senatorial elites and thus of the nature of imperial rule in this period more generally. First, the findings reveal that in this period social elites were more tightly integrated into the imperial system in order to strengthen the position of the emperors, but this was not accompanied by a social revolution. Thus, while past scholarship has tended to interpret the reform of the senatorial order as an expression of the omnipotent authority of the late antique emperor, able to reconstitute the social elites of the empire into a system in which honour and rank depended solely on the imperial centre (a narrative heavily influenced by the view that the later Roman Empire constituted a highly centralized monarchical state),⁷ our analysis allows us to arrive at a more nuanced understanding of this process. For instance, it suggests that, while social advancement became increasingly attached to service to the emperor in this period, the traditional social hierarchy was largely respected in the process. A case in point is the observance of the existing social stratification in the appointments both

⁶ Amm. 16.1.1–21.

⁷ Löhken (1982) offers a detailed elaboration of this view.

Conclusion

in the provincial administration and in the order of *comites*; another one is the mirroring of the social stratifications of the eastern curial elites in the new senate in Constantinople. This reveals not only that emperors were willing to accommodate senatorial ambitions for rank and distinction, but also that the social differentiation occurred on the basis of existing social hierarchies;⁸ this process led to the centralization of political power in the hands of the tight circle of senatorial families that was able to dominate the political scene in the later fourth century in Rome and Constantinople.⁹

Secondly, it is clear that the senates in Rome and Constantinople constituted an important source of political stability in a period of great fragility in imperial rule. As we have seen, both Constantine and Constantius actively sought the involvement of socially prominent senators in their governments – they often constructed their image as that of a Republican emperor willing to grant further privileges and honours to their senatorial audiences in order to harness their support, and they emphasized the political significance, *auctoritas*, of the senates. Overall, the imperial policies regarding the senates in Constantinople and Rome examined in this analysis bear strong similarities to the characteristics of the early empire, when the Roman senate constituted an important source of legitimacy and political support for the emperor: these characteristics include continuous communication, reciprocal expressions of high esteem, public honours, legal privileges and participation in government;¹⁰ this reveals that the political integration of the traditional social elites and their social prestige was a key requirement for imperial success in the fourth century too.¹¹ The study of imperial policies

⁸ On elite competition for rank and distinction, see Schlinkert (1996) 65–6 and Schmidt-Hofner (2010).

⁹ Rome: Cameron (2011); Weisweiler (2011); Lizzi Testa (2006), (2004); Salzman (2002); Heather (1998) 191–5; Marcone (1993); Novak (1979); and Stein (1968) 121–2. Constantinople: Boulay and Northrup (2016); Moser (2016b) and on the fifth and sixth centuries Begass (2016); Chausson (2016); Brandes (2014).

¹⁰ Flaig (1992) 11–208, 550–68 with Flaig (1997).

¹¹ For senates as a source of political legitimacy in the later Roman Empire more generally, see Börm (2010) and Heather (1998) 197–204. See also Lizzi Testa (2013) on the political duties of the senate after Constantine.

Conclusion

regarding the senatorial elites under the Constantinian dynasty thus adds a further nuance to our picture of the nature of imperial rule in this period, and reveals the extent to which the collaboration with the traditional elites was a key element in the maintenance of the imperial position of late antique emperors.

A third point is the fragility of imperial rule and the division of the empire in this period. As we have seen, one means used by Constantius to counter these threats to his rule was an insistence on dynastic descent as a prerequisite for imperial legitimacy.¹² The other measure put in place to improve the stability of the imperial position in the East in particular was the foundation of a second senate in Constantinople and the increased integration of the eastern curial elites into the imperial system. This entailed the separation of the empire into two senatorial realms, creating a self-contained imperial realm in the East by reorganizing its social elites and provinces on the model of Rome. This realm could then be ruled without reference to the emperor at Rome. The integration of the eastern elites is thus an expression of the increased regionalization of imperial rule, which necessitated tighter imperial control over the socio-political resources of the provinces, that is to say, over the leading elites of the provincial cities. Seen from this angle, the creation of a hereditary senatorial class in the East is thus also an expression of new spatial conceptions of empire and a realization that this space could be modelled according to the needs of empire, a development powerfully reflected in the increased regionalization of government.¹³ For the first time in its history the eastern provinces were no longer conceived as several different regions but as one political unit independent of Rome with its own senatorial elite. The creation of a second senate in Constantinople was thus a

¹² On the importance of the dynastic aspect for the construction of legitimate imperial rule in the later Roman Empire, see my discussion of the dynastic representation of the sons of Constantine in public statuary, Moser (2016a) and more generally Pfeilschifter (2013) 14–18.

¹³ Spatial conceptions: Migl (1994) 249–53; Straub (1964) 296. Regionalization of government: e.g. Migl (1994); Stein (1968) 117–20.

Conclusion

response to the regionalization of the empire, but at the same time accelerated this process by dividing the empire into two self-contained imperial realms, paving the way for the complete political separation of the empire under later emperors.¹⁴

Fourthly, the approach pursued here of tracing the integration of eastern elites, in its full administrative and political context from 324 to 361, has made it possible to identify continuities and breaks and to arrive at a more nuanced chronology of this process. This period was divided into two phases. In the period from 324 to 350, when Roman senators continued to serve in high office in the East, eastern elites were integrated into the imperial system by the award of equestrian honours. Only a few were able to profit from Constantius' continuous presence in the eastern capital Antioch, where they were able to occupy the senatorial post of *consularis Syriae*. The second phase ran from 350 to 361. A characteristic of this period is the detachment of the eastern provinces from the senate in Rome and the establishment of a *cursus honorum* in the East, which was coordinated with the creation of a senate in Constantinople on the model of Rome. From 350 onwards, imperial rule in the East no longer depended on political support from Rome, and the political significance of the senate of Rome as a source of political legitimacy was henceforth restricted to the western half of the empire. What this suggests is that the senate in Constantinople was used for the first time as an equivalent to the senate in Rome in 350, and that this was prompted by Constantius' decision to wage civil war against Magnentius. In this situation, Constantius used the urban council of Constantinople as a second senate to legitimize his imperial position against the usurping emperor at Rome, which accelerated the process of integrating the eastern elites into the imperial system that we have traced from Constantine's victory over Licinius onwards. These findings have important consequences for our periodization

¹⁴ These later developments are discussed in e.g. McEvoy (2013); Grig and Kelly (2012); Meier (2009); Schmidt-Hofner (2008); Errington (2006); Millar (2006); Lenski (2002); Matthews (1975).

Conclusion

of the fourth century, which is often centred on the reigns of Constantine and Julian: they suggest that Constantius had a decisive impact on the transformation of the shape of the empire.

Fifth, my analysis of how a senatorial order emerged in the East yields important insights into the character of the senatorial aristocracy that developed in Constantinople. The emerging senatorial class was an officeholding aristocracy. Structured by and large by the same regulations, political institutions and traditions as the old senate in Rome, these senators were assembled in a second Roman senate in Constantinople. Importantly, Constantinople became a second Rome not in order to rival Rome's function among the social elites of the empire but to allow an improved integration of the eastern elites into the imperial system; this was to be done by means of an institution that would also harness their personal networks and their wealth more fruitfully for the interests of empire.¹⁵ This process, the alignment of Greek curial culture with Roman social structures, was a matter of discussion and unease among contemporaries.¹⁶ Nevertheless, while we are well-informed about the self-conception of senators in the West, only a little is known about how the senators in Constantinople constructed their individual political identity in the eastern Roman Empire, and there is debate about the extent to which the senate in Constantinople was able to produce a strong *esprit de corps* in the long run.¹⁷ Still, evidence from the fourth century, not least Julian's policies discussed below, reveals that the senators in Constantinople were willing and able to act as a group to coax the emperor into acting in their interests, and it is likely that further study of the relationships between

¹⁵ For the close links between senatorial property and imperial interests, see Moser (2016b); Weisweiler (2011); and more generally Banaji (2007); Wickham (2005); Vera (1995).

¹⁶ The classic study is Dagon (1968).

¹⁷ On the self-conception of the senators of Rome in the later fourth and fifth centuries, see Weisweiler (2015a) and Näf (1995) 1–245; on the self-description of eastern senators, see Näf (1995) 246 and Pfeilschifter (2013) 452–510, who are both sceptical about the ability of the senate in Constantinople to act as a unified political power group, but see Börm (2010) and below.

Conclusion

emperors and senators in Constantinople will produce similar results in relation to their dealings in later centuries.¹⁸

Taken together, this study has revealed the crucial importance of the senatorial elites of Rome and Constantinople as a key constituency of political support in the context of the fragility of imperial rule in the first half of the fourth century. The examination of the senatorial administration in the East and, alongside this, the thorough analysis of the textual, legal and epigraphic material attesting the emergence of a senatorial class in the East has made it possible to highlight continuities and ruptures between the different phases of the reigns of Constantine and of Constantius II. Their involvement with the eastern elites has for the first time been analysed in a systematic way. We are thus able to offer a revised chronology of the integration of the eastern elites into an eastern senatorial order between 324 and 361 and of its changing function in the imperial system. The discussion revealed that the usurpation of Magnentius in 350 constituted a pivot in this development, accelerating the formation of a senate in Constantinople, with important consequences for the periodization of the history of the Roman Empire in the fourth century and beyond. Finally, it was made clear that detailed engagement with the reign and policies of Constantius II is able to furnish important new insights not only into the political developments of the Roman Empire in his time, between 337 and 361, but also into the political context, nature and consequences of the policies put in place by other emperors of the fourth century.

Constantius died on 3 November 361 in Cilicia, on the way from Antioch to Constantinople. His successor, the emperor Julian, arrived at Constantinople in a glamorous imperial *adventus* on 11 December 361.¹⁹ Like Constantine, Julian was

¹⁸ Constantius II: Moser (2016b); on Valens and the senate in Constantinople, see Heather and Moncur (2001) 137–205, esp. 145–9 and Vanderspoel (1995) 155–86. The political importance of the senate in Constantinople is revealed notably by the revolt of Procopius, on which see Lenski (2002) 68–115. On Theodosius in Constantinople, see Heather (2010); Heather and Moncur (2001) 205–83 and Vanderspoel (1995) 187–216.

¹⁹ *Adventus*: Amm. 22.2.4; Julian in Constantinople: Wienand (2016), Harries (2012) 303–6; Hunt (1998) 61–7; Matthews (1989) 23, 106–7.

Conclusion

faced with the task of rallying support for his rule among the eastern elites. Unlike in the case of Constantine, his task was greatly facilitated by the existence of an eastern senate with its seat in Constantinople. Having arrived in the city, the new emperor underlined his legitimacy with a display of dynastic reverence, dutifully escorting Constantius' body from the harbour to its resting place in the Church of the Apostles, where Constantius was laid to rest next to his father Constantine, the founder of the ruling dynasty.²⁰ Shortly thereafter, Julian began to stage himself as a respectful admirer of the senate of Constantinople. The inauguration ceremony of the consuls Mamertinus and Nevitta in January 362 is a case in point. The emperor accompanied, on foot, the new consuls, duly seated in their curule chairs and with their *fasces*, through the crowds from the palace to the *curia*.²¹ There were also consular games,²² and the names of the consuls were inscribed in the consular lists.²³ The speech of thanks delivered by one of the consuls, Claudius Mamertinus' *gratiarum actio*, was composed in Latin and is full of references to the history and topography of the traditional senate in Rome.²⁴ To call this a snub to eastern senators who knew no Latin would be too simplistic: as I have shown in [Chapters 3, 5 and 6](#), many of the senators in the audience were experienced governors with sufficient knowledge of the Roman language to follow Mamertinus' panegyric. [Chapter 6](#) also revealed that the new senatorial culture in Constantinople was not Greek, but one that proudly shared Rome's (Latin) traditions, not least because membership in the new senate was, as Constantius had insisted, a Roman honour. Mamertinus' Latin speech was, then, rather a mark of respect to the new senate and its membership. Then,

²⁰ *Pan. Lat.* 3(11).27.5; *Lib. Or.* 18.1.20; *Greg. Naz. Or.* 5.16–17.

²¹ *Pan Lat* 3(11).28–30 with Harries (2012) 303–6 and Wienand (2016) on its political context; on consular ceremonies and processions: Sguaitamatti (2012) 137–57.

²² *Amm.* 22.7.2: *dein Mamertino ludos edente circenses*. Consular games: Sguaitamatti (2012) 157–96.

²³ *Amm.* 22.7.1. For a concise discussion of late antique consular lists: Bagnall (1987) 47–57.

²⁴ E.g. *Pan. Lat.* 3(11).30.3–4; 29.5–30.3. See commentary by Nixon and Rogers (1994) 386–436.

Conclusion

following the pattern established by earlier emperors, in an act reminiscent of Constantius' arrival in Rome in 352, a month later on 5 February 362 Julian issued a law to protect senators from unjust accusations in court, including himself among them: 'the rights of senators and the authority of that order in which we number ourselves also must be defended from all outrages' (*ius senatorum et auctoritatem eius ordinis, in qui nos quoque ipsos esse numeramus, necesse est ab omni iniuria defendere*).²⁵ In May he added financial privileges: Constantius had exempted senators from most duties relating to the collection of taxes, with the notable exception of the tax for recruits.²⁶ On 13 May 362 Julian ruled that even this compulsory service was beneath senatorial dignity.²⁷ Moreover, like Constantius Julian displayed his *civilitas* in Constantinople, by participating frequently in the debates and delivering speeches which, so it is claimed, he composed at night.²⁸

Like Constantius, Julian showed his support for the senatorial culture of Constantinople. According to Zosimus, Julian contributed all his books to the great library of the city, built for and frequented by the senators.²⁹ Julian also invested in the urban fabric of Constantinople. He is known to have built a new harbour, alongside many other buildings mentioned in an erratic list in Zosimus.³⁰ Like Constantius, Julian realized that praise of the city would equal praise for the emperor. One monument is particularly interesting in this context. A letter to the Alexandrians reveals that Julian intended to ship an obelisk to Constantinople, which, like the one erected in Rome by Constantius, had been cut for Constantine, who died before he could arrange its erection. Julian, who was born in

²⁵ *CTh* 9.2.1 (5 February 362). For an earlier use of the traditional notion of the emperor as a *primus inter pares* in Constantinople: Them. *Or.* 4.53b–c on Constantius, discussed in Chapter 6, pp. 258–9.

²⁶ *CTh* 11.23.1 discussed in Moser (2016b) 438–45, with refs.

²⁷ *CTh* 11.23.2.

²⁸ *Amm.* 22.7.3; *Lib. Or.* 18.154; speeches composed at night: *Soc.* 3.1.54; *Pan. Lat.* 3(11).24.5; *Lib. Or.* 18.154 with den Boeft et al. (1995) 69.

²⁹ *Zos.* 3.11.3.

³⁰ *Zos.* 3.11.4. Julian's contributions to Constantinople are discussed by Mango (1985) 39 and also Kelly (2003) 596–7; Henck (2001); Humphrey (1986) 288.

Conclusion

Constantinople, ordered it to be sent there and explained: ‘The city claims the monument from me because she is the place of my birth and closer to me than to Constantius. For he loved her as a sister, but I love her as a mother; and I was in fact born and brought up in the place and cannot lack feeling for her.’³¹ Like Constantius, who in Rome appealed to the Roman origin of his mother Fausta, so Julian was using his personal links with Constantinople to illustrate his love for the city. In his attempt to arrange a durable reconciliation with the eastern capital, Julian’s policies in Constantinople closely followed the pattern of Constantius’ efforts after taking Rome a decade earlier, and Constantine’s efforts in 312. Even his trials at Chalcedon, where his new consul was on the board of judges, followed an established pattern. Many of Constantius’ senior officials were put on trial and exiled or sentenced to death, just as Constantius had investigated the close supporters of Magnentius in 353. As in the case of Constantius, Julian’s trials too were accompanied by a conscious display of civility in the senate.³²

Soon Julian appointed leading eastern adherents of Constantius to support his position in the eastern provinces. Constantius’ *comes Orientis* since 358, Domitius Modestus, became Julian’s first Prefect of Constantinople.³³ A certain Helpidius, possibly a native of Antioch, who had been a palatine official at the court of Constantius since 355, for instance as messenger between the emperor and his Caesar in Gaul, was appointed *comes rei privatae* at Julian’s court, where he was thus responsible for the emperor’s finances.³⁴ Julian was also able to draw on the support of Aelius Claudius Dulcitus, who had begun his career as a notary and had then managed to enter the senate and be appointed *consularis* of Phoenicia

³¹ Jul. *Ep.* 48 (trans. Wright 1923). On Julian’s education in Constantinople, see Harries (2012) 296–9; rivalry with Rome: Ward-Perkins (2012).

³² Matthews (1989) 106–7; it is possible that, as Potter (2004) 461 suggests, Julian’s statement that he had been forced into these trials by the army is a deliberate reprise of the official story that the army had instigated the dynastic murders of 337.

³³ *PLRE* I: 605 (Modestus 2).

³⁴ *PLRE* I: 415 (Helpidius 6) with Bradbury (2004) 246–7. Olszaniec (2013) Helpidius.

Conclusion

and, possibly, *vicarius* of Thrace, both before 361 when he was appointed proconsul in Asia, an office which he held until 363.³⁵

Julian's reign marked the end of one of the most profound transformations in the history of the later Roman Empire: the transformation of the eastern elites into a second senatorial order in Constantinople. This book has argued that this process was rooted in the importance of the senatorial elites in the context of the continuous fragility of imperial rule under Constantine and Constantius. I have shown how the eastern curial elites were integrated into the imperial regime by the award of equestrian honours under Constantine, and through the creation of a senate in Constantinople under Constantius, when they became a pivotal source of political stability in the East. The integration of the eastern elites was a necessary means of risk-reduction, a source of political stability in the continuing context of fragile imperial power. The integration of the curial classes of the East into a second senate powerfully reveals not a narrative of decline and fall of the Roman Empire, but rather its resilience and ability to use its institutional traditions to cope with political and social change.

³⁵ *PLRE* I: 274 (Dulcitius 5).

APPENDIX A

ROMAN SENATORS IN OFFICE IN ASIA
AND SYRIA, 275–305

Date	Name	Career and Family
<i>In Asia (proconsul Asiae)</i>		
Mid/late 3rd c.	Cossinius Rufinus 14 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 776)	Probably related to or identical with Cossinius Rufinus 15, PVR in 315–16 and consul in 316; perhaps son of P. Cosinius Felix <i>PIR</i> ² C 1530
286/293 for two years	T. Flavius Festus 7 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 335; Malcus [1967] 91–3)	proconsul of Asia in 286/293 for two years
286/305	Priscus 1 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 729) =? Priscus 2	v.c. <i>proconsul Asiae</i> in 286/305; <i>proconsul Europae</i> in 303/305; possibly identical with Priscus 2 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 729)
287/298, c. 293?	L. Artorius Pius Maximus 43 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 589; Chastagnol (1962) 30–1 no. 8; Malcus (1967) 93–4)	v.c. <i>legatus Syriae Coeles</i> <i>legatus pro praetore</i> after 286, <i>proconsul Asiae</i> in 287/298, PVR 298–9. From Ephesus?
293/303	Junius Tiberianus 7 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 912; Chastagnol (1962) 40 no. 13; Malcus (1967) 94)	v.c. <i>proconsul Asiae</i> in 293/303, PVR 303–4 Family: his father was probably Tiberianus 8 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 912), consul in 281, PVR in 291–2, consul II prior in 291
293/305	An(nius?) (Epi?) phanus 5 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 281; Malcus (1967) 95–6)	proconsul of Asia in 286/305

(continued)

Appendix A

Date	Name	Career and Family
293/305	Aurelius Hermogenes 8 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 424; Chastagnol (1962) 51 no. 19; Malcus (1967) 95–6)	<i>proconsul Asiae</i> 286/305, PVR 309–10 (under Maxentius) Possibly a relative of <i>PLRE</i> I: 423 (Hermogenes 2), PVR in 349 to 350
<i>In Syria</i>		
275–81?	Julius Saturninus 12 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 808)	Governor of Syria?
275/276	Maximinus 1 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 576)	Relative of the emperor Tacitus
276/82?	Cl. Cleobolus 2 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 261)	
bef. 278	Virius Lupus 5 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 522)	<i>praeses Syriae Coeles et Arabiae,</i> <i>iudex sacracum cognitionum per</i> <i>Aegyptum et per Oriente</i> (bef. 278), consul II in 278 (with the emperor Probus), PVR in 278–80 Possible descendants: <i>PLRE</i> I: 522 (Virius Lupus 6), proconsul of Africa, 337/361 <i>PLRE</i> I: 521 (Lupus 1), <i>consularis Campaniae</i> , 361/363 <i>PLRE</i> I: 522 (Virius Lupus 7), <i>consularis Campaniae</i> , mid/ late 4th c. ? <i>PLRE</i> I: 521 (Fl. Lupus 3), <i>praefectus annonae</i> c. Mid/ late 4th c. <i>PLRE</i> I: 522 (Fl. Lupus 4), <i>consularis Campaniae</i> , late 4th c.
Mid/late 3rd c.?	Anonymus 126 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 1024)	Governor of Syria. Ancestor of Aradius Rufinus 11, PVR in 376 and possibly of Aradius Rufinus 10, PVR III 312–3, consul 311

Appendix A

Date	Name	Career and Family
bef. 286	L. Artorius Pius Maximus 43 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 589); see above under proconsuls	
Late 3rd or early 4th c.	Arrius Maximus 33 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 586)	v.c. <i>consularis provinciae Syriae Coeles</i> . Possibly from the family of the Arrii of Cirta <i>PIR</i> ² I: 214, perhaps identical with Arrius Maximus <i>PIR</i> ² A 1098.
290	Charisius I (<i>PLRE</i> I: 200)	<i>praeses Syriae Coeles</i> .
bef. 298, 291/ 297?	L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius 12 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 260)	<i>curator operum publicorum</i> (c. 287–8), <i>curator aquarum et Miniciae</i> (c. 288–9), <i>corrector utriusque Italiae</i> (c. 289–90/93), <i>praeses Syriae Coeles, iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius Orientis</i> (= <i>letagus Augusti pro praetore</i>), <i>proconsul Africae</i> 298, PVR in 301–2 Possible descendants: <i>PLRE</i> I: 259 (P. Helvius Aelius Dionysius 8), v.c. <i>corrector Campaniae</i> , early 4th c. <i>PLRE</i> I: 259 (Fl. Dionysius 11), <i>consularis Phoenices</i> in 328–9, <i>consularis Syriae</i> in 329/335, <i>comes constitorianus</i> in 335, see Appendix B
293/305	Latinius Primosus (<i>PLRE</i> I: 725)	v.c. <i>praeses Syriae</i> in 293/305
c. 303	Aelius Flavianus	v.c. <i>praeses of Palestina</i> , see Davenport (2010) 349–57.
305	Locrius (Lucerius) Verinus 1 + 2 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 950 + <i>PLRE</i> I: 951)	<i>praeses Syriae, iudex sacrarum cognitionum totius orientis</i> (= <i>legatus Augusti pro praetore</i>) in 305, provincial governor or <i>vicarius</i> in 314; <i>vicarius Africae</i> (c. 318–21); PVR in 323–5

(continued)

Appendix A

Date	Name	Career and Family
Late 3rd/ early 4th c.	Anonymus 126 (<i>PLRE I</i> : 1024)	governor of Syria, late 3rd/ early 4th c. Descendants: <i>PLRE I</i> : 775 (Aradius Rufinus 10), cos. 311, PVR 312–13 <i>PLRE I</i> : 747 (Proculus 11) <i>PLRE I</i> : 775 Aradius Rufinus 11, <i>comes Orientis</i> 363–4, PVR 376, see <i>stemma</i> 30, <i>PLRE</i> : 1147

This table draws on the results of *PLRE I*, PIR², Malcus (1967), Chastagnol (1962) and the literature discussed in [Chapter 1](#). Recorded religious offices are omitted.

APPENDIX B

SENATORIAL POSTS IN THE EASTERN
ADMINISTRATION (ORIENS) UNDER
CONSTANTINE, 324–337

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
I Reinstated senatorial posts		
1.1. Governors with wide-ranging authorities: Proconsuls and vicarii/comites Orientis		
1.1.1 Proconsules Asiae		
326/332 for two years <i>proconsul Asiae</i> , Domitius Zenophilus (PLRE I: 993) + Anonymus 37) (PLRE I: 1012)	320 <i>corrector Siciliae</i> and <i>corrector</i> of an unknown province, 320 <i>consularis Numidiae</i> , (?) <i>proconsul Achaiae</i> , 325/327 <i>proconsul Asiae</i> (for two years), 328–33 <i>proconsul Africae</i> (for 4 years), 333 <i>consul</i>	From a senatorial family from North Africa: his brother Domitius Latronianus 2 (PLRE I: 496) was also <i>proconsul</i> in Africa in 321/324.
324/334 <i>proconsul Asiae et Hellesponti</i> , Anicius Paulinus iunior 14 (PLRE I: 679)	c. 315/320 <i>legate</i> in Africa, 324/334 <i>proconsul Asiae et Hellesponti</i> , 334 <i>consul</i> , 334–5 PVR	Father: Julianus 23 (PLRE I: 473), <i>proconsul Africae</i> bef. 322, cos. 322, PVR 326–9; the family is discussed in <i>stemma</i> 7 in PLRE I: 1134

(continued)

Appendix B

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
330/335 <i>proconsul</i> <i>Asiae</i> , Ceionius Rufius Albinus 14 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 37) + Anonymus 12 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 1006)	328 <i>consularis</i> <i>Campaniae</i> , 328/333 <i>proconsul</i> <i>Achaiae</i> , 330/ 335 <i>proconsul</i> <i>Asiae</i> , 335 consul, 335–7 PVR	exiled but recalled by Constantine; father: <i>PLRE</i> I: 976 Volusianus 4, PVR 310–11, cos. 311, PVR 313–5, cos. 314, see <i>stemma</i> 13 in <i>PLRE</i> I: 1138
324/337 <i>proconsul</i> <i>Asiae</i> , Fabius Titianus 6 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 918)	324 <i>corrector</i> <i>Flaminiae</i> <i>et Piceni</i> , <i>consularis</i> <i>Siciliae</i> , 324/ 337 <i>proconsul</i> <i>Asiae</i> , <i>comes</i> <i>ordinis primi</i> , 337 consul, 339–41 PVR, 341–50 PPO (Gaul), 350 PVR II	Titianus may be a relative of Celsinus 4, PVR 352 and Rufinus 25, see <i>stemma</i> 27 in <i>PLRE</i> I: 1146
<i>i.i.2 Their legates</i>		
324/335 <i>Legatus</i> <i>proconsulis</i> , Lucius Crepereius Madalianus (<i>PLRE</i> I: 530)	See below	
324/337 <i>Legatus</i> <i>proconsulis</i> <i>Asiae</i> , C. Julius Rufinianus Ablabius Tatianus 4 (<i>PLRE</i> I. 875)	324 <i>patrono</i> <i>rationum</i> <i>summarum</i> (<i>aduocatus</i> <i>fisci</i>), <i>adlectu</i> <i>inter consulares</i> <i>iudicio diui</i> <i>Constantini</i>	

Appendix B

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
	(<i>CIL</i> X 1125 = <i>ILS</i> 2942, Campania), <i>corrector</i> <i>Tusciae et</i> <i>Umbriae</i> , after 324 <i>leg. prov.</i> <i>Asiae, consularis</i> <i>Aemiliae et</i> <i>Liguriae</i> , after 337 <i>consularis</i> <i>Campaniae</i>	
1.1.3 vicariū/comites	Orientis	
325 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Orientis</i> , Valerius Maximus 49 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 590)	325 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Orientis</i> , 326–3 PPO in Oriens (with Constantine upon his return from Rome), 327 consul	Prob. not related to family of <i>PLRE</i> I: 590 Maximus 48
326 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Orientis</i> , Dracilianus? <i>agens vicem</i> PPO (in <i>Oriens</i>) (<i>PLRE</i> I: 271)		
325/337 <i>comes</i> <i>Orientis?</i> , Ianuarius 2 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 453)		
330/336 <i>comes</i> <i>Orientis</i> , Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus 5 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 512)	quaestor, praetor, <i>consularis</i> <i>albei Tiberis</i> <i>et cloacarum</i> , <i>cons. operum</i> <i>publicum</i> , 328	presumably a descendant of L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus (who served in senatorial post in the East in the 3rd c.), see <i>PIR</i> ² E 36

(continued)

Appendix B

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
335 <i>comes</i> <i>Orientis</i> , Flavius Felicianus 5 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 330)?	<i>consularis</i> <i>aquarum et</i> <i>Miniciae</i> , c. 329/334 <i>consularis</i> <i>Campaniae</i> , <i>comes Flavialis</i> , 330/336 <i>comes</i> <i>Orientis</i> , <i>comes ordinis</i> <i>primi</i> , 334/ 337 <i>proconsul</i> <i>Africae</i> , 340/ 349 <i>comes</i> <i>ordinis primi</i> <i>intra palatium</i> of Constans, 342 PVR, 355 consul, 355–6 PPO in Illyricum of Constantius II	
I.ii) simple governorships: consulares <i>i.ii.1) in Asia Minor</i>	335? <i>comes</i> <i>Orientis</i> , 337 consul	
329/336 <i>consularis</i> (<i>Ponti et?</i>) <i>Bithyniae</i> , Julius Aurelianus 7 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 130)	329/336 <i>consularis</i> (<i>Ponti et?</i>) <i>Bithyniae</i> , bef. 337 <i>consularis</i> <i>Campania</i>	

Appendix B

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
334/337 <i>consularis</i> <i>Ponti et</i> <i>Bithyniae,</i> Lucius Crepereius Madalianus I (PLRE I: 530)	bef. 324 quaestor, praetor, after 324 <i>legatus</i> <i>pro praetore</i> <i>provincia</i> <i>Asiae; legatus</i> <i>proconsulis</i> <i>Africae,</i> <i>consularis</i> <i>aedium</i> <i>sacrarum;</i> <i>consularis</i> <i>molium fari</i> <i>et purgaturae,</i> <i>comes ordinis</i> <i>secundi, comes</i> <i>Flavialis,</i> 333 <i>corrector</i> <i>Flaminiae et</i> <i>Piceni; 334/</i> 337 <i>consularis</i> <i>Ponti et</i> <i>Bithyniae, 337/</i> 340 <i>praefectus</i> <i>annonae cum</i> <i>iure gladii, 341</i> <i>vicarius Italiae;</i> <i>comes ordinis</i> <i>primi, proconsul</i> <i>Africae</i>	
I.ii.2) in Syria 328–29 <i>consularis</i> <i>Phoenices, Fl.</i> Dionysius II (PLRE I: 259)	328–9 <i>consularis</i> <i>Phoenices, 329/</i> 335 <i>consularis</i> <i>Syriae, bef.</i> 335 <i>comes</i> <i>consistorium</i>	From Sicily; poss. related to L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius 12, PVR 301–2, <i>praeses Syriae</i> <i>Coeles, iudex sacrarum</i> <i>cognitionum totius</i> <i>Orientis</i> in late 3rd c. (see Appendix A)

(continued)

Appendix B

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
335 <i>consularis</i> <i>Phoenices</i> , Archelaus I	335 <i>consularis</i> <i>Phoenices</i> , 340 <i>comes Orientis</i> ?	From Antioch?
329/335 <i>consularis</i> <i>Syriae</i> , Fl. Dionysius II	See above	
Late 3rd/ early 4th c.? <i>consularis</i> <i>Syriae</i> , Arrius Maximus 33	See above Appendix A	
2. New senatorial posts: Equestrian posts (combined and) upgraded to senatorial rank		
325/330 <i>consularis</i> <i>Europae et</i> <i>Thraciae</i> , L. Aradius Valerius Proculus II (<i>PLRE</i> I: 747)	Praetor, 318–20 legate of the proconsul of Africa in Numidia, <i>peraequator</i> <i>census prov.</i> <i>Calleciae</i> , 322/324 <i>consularis of</i> <i>Byzacena</i> , 325/330 <i>consularis Europae</i> <i>et Thraciae</i> , c. 330 <i>consularis</i> <i>Siciliae</i> , <i>comes</i> <i>ordinis secundi</i> , <i>comes ordinis</i> <i>primi</i> , bef. 333 <i>proconsul Africae</i> <i>vice sacra iudicans</i> with unappellable jurisdiction in all provinces of PPO, <i>comes iterum</i> <i>ordinis primi intra</i> <i>palatium</i> , 337–8 PVR, 340 consul, 351–2 PVR II	From a distinguished senatorial family (see <i>stemma</i> 30 in <i>PLRE</i> I: 1147): <i>insignem</i> <i>nobilitate prosapiam</i> <i>Proculi c.v.</i> (<i>AE</i> 1934, 158)

Appendix B

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
324/335 <i>consularis</i> <i>Phrygiae et</i> <i>Cariae</i> , Lucius Castrius Constans I (<i>PLRE</i> I: 219)	324/335 <i>Consularis</i> <i>Phrygiae et</i> <i>Cariae</i>	
335–337 <i>praefectus</i> <i>Aegypti</i> c.v., Flavius Philagrius 5 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 694)	Bef. 335 <i>rationalis</i> (equestrian post), 335–7 <i>praefectus</i> <i>Aegypti</i> c.v., 338–40 <i>praef.</i> <i>Aegypti iterum</i> , 343 comes, 348–50 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Ponticae</i>	From Cappadocia; studied in Athens
3. Equestrian administration: equestrian vicarii/praesides		
324/328 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Asianae</i> , Flavius Ablabius (<i>PLRE</i> I: 3)	bef. 319 office in Crete, possibly in 319 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Italiae</i> , 324 office at court, poss. office in Italy, 324/ 328 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Asianae</i> , 328– 37 PPO in Oriens	
334–335 <i>vicarius</i> <i>Asianae</i> Veronicianus (<i>PLRE</i> I: 952)		
333/337 <i>praeses</i> <i>Lyciae</i> , Aurelius Fabius Faustinus 10 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 328)		

(continued)

Appendix B

Date and Name	Career	Social Background/ Family
333/337 <i>praeses</i> <i>Helenoponti</i> , Flavius Iulius Leontius 23 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 503)		
Bef. 337 <i>praeses</i> <i>Pontis</i> , Claudius Longinus 3 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 515)		
337–341 <i>praeses</i> <i>Thraciae</i> , Flavius Palladius 17 = Palladius 16? (<i>PLRE</i> I: 661)	335 <i>agens in</i> <i>rebus</i> in Egypt, 337–41 <i>praeses</i> <i>Thraciae</i>	
326 <i>praeses</i> <i>Thebais</i> , Valerius Victorianus (<i>PLRE</i> I: 962)		
329 <i>praeses</i> <i>Thebais</i> , Flavius Gregorius (<i>PLRE</i> I: 962)		
332 <i>praeses</i> <i>Thebais</i> , Fl. Quintilianus (<i>PLRE</i> I: 962)		

This table draws on the results from *PLRE* I, Barnes (1982), Martindale (1980), Malcus (1967) and Chastagnol (1962) and the literature discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Recorded religious offices are omitted. For section 3 ('equestrian administration') more offices are listed in Barnes (1982).

APPENDIX C

THE HIGHER RANKING SENATORIAL
ADMINISTRATION, 337–349

Date	Name and Career
<i>PPO It (Praetorian prefect of Italy)</i>	
340–1	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 548, 545, 549?) Marcellinus 16 + Marcellinus 5 + Marcellinus 22?
342–4	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 705) Placidus 2, earlier: <i>comes</i> <i>Orientis</i> 340–2
344–7	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 782) Vulcacius Rufinus 25, earlier: <i>consularis Numidiae</i> , <i>comes</i> <i>ordinis primi intra consistorium</i> , 342 <i>comes Orientis</i>
347–9	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 510) PPO It and PVR Ulpianus Limenius 2, earlier: proconsul of Constantinople c. 342
349	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 423) PPO It and PVR Hermogenes 2
<i>PVR (Urban prefect of Rome)</i>	
10/3/337–13/1/338	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 747) Proculus 11, earlier career: see Appendix B
13/1/338–14/7/339	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 433) Maecilius Hilarianus 5, earlier in 324 <i>proconsul Africae</i> , cos. 332
25/10/339–25/2/341	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 918) Titianus 6; earlier career: see Appendix B
25/2/341–1/4/342	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 192) Celsinus 4, earlier: <i>proconsul Africae</i> (338/340)
1/4–6/7/342	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 512) Lollianus 5; earlier career, see Appendix B
6/7/342–11/4/344	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 187) Aconius Catullinus 3, earlier: <i>consularis Gallaeciae</i> , 338–9 <i>vicarius Africae</i> , PPO of Constans
11/4–5/7/344	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 787) Rusticus 2
5/7/345–26/12/346	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 735) Petronius Probinus 2, cos. 341

(continued)

Appendix C

Date	Name and Career
26/12/346–12/6/347	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 705) Placidus 2, <i>comes Orientis</i> 340–2 and PPO It 342–4
12/6/347–8/4/349	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 510) PVR and PPO It Ulpius Limenius 2
19/5/349–27/2/350	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 423) PVR and PPO It Hermogenes 2
<i>PPO III (Praetorian prefect of Illyricum)</i>	
344–7	Vina(eo)nius Anatolius the Older, from Berytus where he studies Latin law before going to Rome, then career in West and in 339 appointment as <i>vicarius Asiana</i> ; career after Bradbury (2000) and Şahin (2015) revising <i>PLRE</i> I: 59 (Anatolius 3).
347	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 782) Vulcacius Rufinus 25, earlier: <i>consularis Numidiae</i> , <i>comes ordinis primi intra consistorium</i> , 342 <i>comes Orientis</i> and 344–7 PPO It
<i>Proconsul of Achaia</i>	
Early 340s?	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 192, 193) Adelphius Celsinus 6 + 7?, earlier: bef. 333 <i>corrector</i> in Italy, 333/337 <i>consularis Numidiae</i> ; later: PVR in 351
Late 340s	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 811) Scylacius I (Aegina); earlier: office at court, 343 <i>vicarius Asiana</i>
349	First known (by name) <i>proconsul of Achaia</i> (others known only as ‘from Italy’): (<i>PLRE</i> I: 828) Severianus
<i>Proconsul of Constantinople</i>	
bef. 342	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 40) Alexander 3; from Athens
342	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 510) Ulpius Limenius 2, later PVR and PPO It in 349
343	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 268) Donatus I
<i>Proconsul of Asia</i>	
Early 340s?	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 192, 193) Adelphius Celsinus 6+7?, earlier: bef. 333 <i>corrector</i> in Italy, 333/7 <i>consularis Numidiae</i> ; later: PVR in 351

Appendix C

Date	Name and Career
349(–350/1?)	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 608) L. Caelius Montius + (<i>PLRE</i> I: 535) Magnus 11 + with his legate Caelius Ianuarianus 1 (<i>PLRE</i> I: 452)
<i>Vicarius of Asiana</i>	
339	Anatolius the Older (see above)
c. 343	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 811) Scylacius 1; before office at court
<i>Vicarius of Pontus</i>	
348–50	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 694) Flavius Philagrius, first clarissimate prefect of Egypt of Constantine (in 335–7, and again 339–40); <i>comes</i> at council of Serdica in 343
<i>Comes Orientis</i>	
340?	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 100) Archelaus 1; earlier: <i>consularis Phoenices</i> in 335 (+ <i>PLRE</i> I: 101, Archelaus 6, v.c., <i>comes et praeses Arabiae</i> in 349/350?)
340–2	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 705) Placidus 2, see above
342	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 782) Vulcacius Rufinus 25, earlier: <i>consularis Numidiae</i> and <i>comes ordinis primi intra consistorium</i>
349	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 500, 503) Leontius 5 = 22 (6 April), later: 351/354 <i>quaestor sacrii palatii</i> , 355 PVR
349	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 546) Marcellinus 7 (9 Oct.) = (<i>PLRE</i> I: 545) Marcellinus 6, earlier: bef. 342 <i>praeses Phoenices</i>
<i>PPO O (Praetorian prefect of the East)</i>	
338–40	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 11) Septimius Acindynus 2; earlier: bef. 324/337 <i>corrector Tusciae et Umbriae</i> , <i>vicarius</i> in Spain, possibly proconsul in Achaea; cos. 340 (with Saquette 2000)
340–344/5	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 502) Flavius Domitius Leontius 20; cos. 344
345/6–351	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 696) Flavius Philippus 7
<i>Consularis Syriae (Coele)</i>	
347	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 896) Theodorus 5/6, bef. 346 v.p. <i>praeses Arabiae</i>

(continued)

Appendix C

Date	Name and Career
348	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 431) Fl. Antonius Hierocles 3, from Tarsus, earlier: bef. 343/7? governor of Arabia
349	Anatolius the Younger, later: in 355 PPO III, having declined the office of PVR
<i>Consularis Phoenices</i>	
342	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 545) Marcellinus 6 = (<i>PLRE</i> I: 546) Marcellinus 7, 349 <i>comes Orientis</i>

This table draws on the results of *PLRE* I and the literature discussed in [Chapter 4](#).

APPENDIX D

THE HIGHER RANKING EASTERN
SENATORIAL ADMINISTRATION IN THE
EAST (ILLYRICUM AND ORIENS), 350–361

Date	Name	Notes/Career
PPO III (Praetorian prefect of Illyricum)		
351/3	Flavius Philippus 7?	earlier: v.p. <i>comes</i> of Constantine, then of Constantius II; 344–51 PPO in Oriens
354–5	(PLRE I: 978) Volusianus 5	earlier: <i>consularis Byzacena</i> ?
355–6	(PLRE I: 612) Lollianus 5	see Appendix B
357–60	Anatolius the Younger, see Appendix C	earlier: 349 <i>consularis Syriae</i> , c. 352/3 proconsul in Constantinople, see Appendix C
360–1	(PLRE I: 365) Fl. Florentius 10	earlier: <i>comes</i> of Constantius, 357–60 PPO in Gaul
Proconsul of Achaia		
352/3	(PLRE I: 611) Cl. Strategius Musonianus	earlier: v.p. <i>comes</i> of Constantine, then of Constantius II; 350–2? proconsul of Constantinople
bef. 356	(PLRE I: 612) Musonius	an Athenian
c. 357	(PLRE I: 423–4) Flavius Hermogenes 3=9	earlier: office at court in Constantinople and Antioch; a native of Pontus
359/360	(PLRE I: 56) Publius Ampelius 3	earlier: <i>praeses Cappadocia</i> ?, 355/358 <i>magister officiorum</i> of Constantius in Milan
Proconsul Urban Prefect of Constantinople (PVC)		
c. 350–2	(PLRE I: 611) Cl. Strategius Musonianus	earlier: v.p. <i>comes</i> of Constantine, then of Constantius II; 349 v.p. <i>praeses</i> of Thebais

(continued)

Appendix D

Date	Name	Notes/Career
353/354	Anatolius the Younger	earlier: 349 <i>consularis Syriae</i>
355	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 489) Justinus 2	reads letter of adlection of Themistius
356	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 94) Araxius	earlier: <i>consularis Palestinae</i> , 353 <i>vicarius</i> of Pontus
359	First PVC (<i>PLRE I</i> : 438) Honoratus 2	earlier: <i>consularis Syriae</i> , 353–4 <i>comes</i> , 355–7 PPO in Gaul
<i>Proconsul of Asia</i>		
349(– 350/1)	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 608) L. Caelius Montius Magnus + (<i>PLRE I</i> : 535) (Magnus 11)	
351	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 560) Marinus	sets up statues to Fl. Philippus
352/ 3–354	<i>proconsul Asia</i> and <i>vicarius Asianae</i> (<i>PLRE I</i> : 535) Fl. Magnus 9	
360	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 470) Julianus 11	earlier: <i>consularis Phoenices</i>
361–3	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 274) Dulcitus 5	earlier: <i>notarius</i> and <i>comes</i> of Constantius, <i>consularis Phoenices</i> , <i>vicarius/consularis</i> of Thrace
<i>Vicarius of Asiana</i>		
352/ 3–354	<i>proconsul Asia</i> and <i>vicarius Asianae</i> (<i>PLRE I</i> : 535) Fl. Magnus 9	
350/360?	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 80) Fl. Anysius 3	
350/360?	(<i>PLRE II</i> : 876) Att(ius) Philippus 8	
350/360?	(<i>PLRE II</i> : 1016) Fl. Simplicius 13	
360	(<i>PLRE I</i> : 392) Germanus 1	

Appendix D

Date	Name	Notes/Career
361	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 466) Italicianus	from Italy, but career in East: 355 at court of Constantius II in the West, 359 <i>praefectus Aegypti</i> , 360 <i>consularis Syriae</i> , marries into powerful Antiochean family
<i>Vicarius of Pontus/Pietatis</i>		
353	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 94) Araxius	earlier: <i>consularis Palestinae</i>
358	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 104) Aristaenetus 1?	
<i>PPO Orientis</i>		
344–51	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 696) Flavius Philippus	earlier: at court (<i>cura palatii</i>) and <i>comes</i>
351–53	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 886) Thalassius 1	earlier: <i>comes</i> of Constantius; from a well-connected curial family from Antioch
353	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 262) Domitianus 3	earlier: <i>comes sacrarum largitionum</i> of Constantius II in Milan
354–8	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 611) Cl. Strategius Musonianus	v.p. <i>comes</i> of Constantine, then of Constantius II; 350–2? proconsul of Constantinople, 352 <i>proconsul Achaiae</i>
358–60	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 423, 424) Fl. Hermogenes 3=9	earlier: bef. 357/8 <i>proconsul Achaiae</i>
361	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 605) Domitius Modestus 2?	later: PVC (362–3) and PPO in Oriens (368–77)
<i>Comes Orientalis palatine staff of Gallus</i>		
351–3	quaestor (<i>PLRE</i> I: 535) Caelius Montius Magnus 11	earlier: 349–51 <i>proconsul Asiae</i> ; <i>patricius</i>
354	quaestor (<i>PLRE</i> I: 500, 502) Leontius 5 = 22	earlier: in 349 <i>comes Orientis</i>

(continued)

Appendix D

Date	Name	Notes/Career
351–4/c. 352	<i>magister officiorum</i> (<i>PLRE</i> I: 658) Palladius 4	earlier: notarius of Constantine, from Antioch
353–4	<i>comes Orientis</i> (<i>PLRE</i> I: 438) Honoratus 2	earlier: <i>consularis Syriae</i>
354–357/ 8	<i>comes Orientis</i> (<i>PLRE</i> I: 619) Nebridius 1	
358–62	<i>comes Orientis</i> (<i>PLRE</i> I: 605) Domitius Modestus 2	
<i>Consularis Syriae Coele</i>		
bef. 353	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 438) Honoratus 2	see above
354	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 907) Theophilus 1	killed in Antioch by the mob encouraged by Caesar Gallus during the food shortage
355	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 258) Dionysius 3?	
356	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 405) Gymnasium 2	a native of Nicaea, summoned to Antioch by PPO Cl. Strategius Musonianus
358	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 628) Nicentius 1	held various unspecified offices before this post
359	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 791) Sabinus 5	rhetor and advocate from Antioch, his son studied under Libanius
360	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 924) Tryphonianus 2	
360	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 466) Italicianus	See above, <i>vicarius Asiana</i>
<i>Consularis Phoenices</i>		
353/4	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 83) Apollinaris 1	arrested by Gallus for treason, exiled with son and then murdered; his son (<i>PLRE</i> I: 83) Apollinaris 2, <i>cura palatii</i> at the court of Gallus, marries the daughter of Domitianus, PPO at court of Gallus

Appendix D

Date	Name	Notes/Career
357	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 289) Euchrostius?	
bef. 358	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 247) Demetrius 2	leading <i>curialis</i> of Tarsus, brother of Julianus 14 and Hierocles 3, <i>consularis Syriae</i> in 348
bef. 359	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 274) Dulcitus 5	see above
bef. 360	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 470) Julianus 11	
360–1	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 64) Andronicus 3	native (prob. <i>curialis</i>) of Constantinople, pupil of Libanius; moves to Tyre after leaving this post; nephew of <i>comes Orientis</i> Nebridius 1?
361	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 839) Siderius	

This table draws on the results of *PLRE* I and the literature discussed in [Chapters 5](#) and [6](#).

APPENDIX E

THE EXPANDED LOWER RANKING
 SENATORIAL ADMINISTRATION IN THE
 EAST (ILLYRICUM AND ORIENS), 350–361

Date	Name	Notes/Career
<i>Consularis Macedoniae</i>		
c. 356	(PLRE I: 643) Olympius 3	registered in Rome; transferred to Constantinople in c. 359
<i>Consularis of Thrace</i>		
359	(PLRE I: 274) Dulcitius 5?	
360	(PLRE I: 602) Miccalus	
<i>Consularis Bithyniae</i>		
Mid 4th c.	(PLRE I: 832) Severus 6	native of Diospontus, former pupil of Himerius
355	(PLRE I: 80) Apellio	
356	(PLRE I: 308) Fl. Eusebius 40	brother of Fl. Hypatius, cos. 359, and Eusebia, wife of Constantius II, from Thessalonica; earlier: c. 355 governor of Hellespontus, then went to Antioch, and from there to Bithynia; cos. 359
357	(PLRE I: 174) Calliopius 1	
357	(PLRE I: 469) Iulianus 8	native of Antioch
361	(PLRE I: 40) Alexander 4	native of Paphlagonia, pupil of Libanius in 355/6
<i>Praeses Cariae</i>		
351/4	(PLRE I: 608) Fl. Quint(ilius?) Eros Monaxius	Roueché (1989) no. 20 with pl. vii

Appendix E

Date	Name	Notes/Career
361/3	Antonius Tatianus = <i>PLRE</i> I: 875 (Tatianus 2?)	
<i>Praeses Lyciae</i>		
350s?	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 647) Olympius 16	
<i>Consularis Ciliciae</i>		
362	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 193) Celsus 3	in senate in 359; student of Libanius
<i>Consularis Euphratensis (senatorial by 357/61)</i>		
356?	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 907) Theophilus 2	a native from Cyrrhus in Syria
c. 359	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 733) Probatius 1?	
359	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 665) Pannychius	
360	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 727) Priscianus 1	native of Berytus, schoolmate of Libanius; later career: <i>praeses Ciliciae</i> 363–4, <i>consularis Palaestinae Prima</i> 364
c. 361	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 471) Julianus 14	from Taurus, brother of Hierocles 3 and Demetrius 2; earlier: governor of Phrygia
<i>Consularis Palaestinae, divided into two provinces in 357</i>		
bef.	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 94)	later: <i>vicarius Ponticae</i> and
353	Araxius	proconsul in Constantinople, see Appendix D
353	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 213) Clematius 1	native of Alexandria, in 353/4 executed under Gallus at Antioch
355	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 871) Syncretius 2	
356	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 339) Firminus 2?	
357	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 213) Clematius 2	<i>agens in rebus</i> for <i>magister officiorum</i> (<i>PLRE</i> I: 658) Palladius 4 of Gallus, later at court of Constantius II in Milan

(continued)

Appendix E

Date	Name	Notes/Career
358	Palestina Primae: (<i>PLRE</i> I: 213) Clematius 2	see above
358	Palestina Salutaris: (<i>PLRE</i> I: 658) Eupaterius	native of Greece
360	Palaestina Primae: (<i>PLRE</i> I: 447) Hypatius 1	
360	Palaestina Salutaris: (<i>PLRE</i> I: 237) Cyrillus 1	native of Tyros in Phoenicia, later: <i>consularis</i> of Palaestina Prima in 361
361	P. Primae: Cyrillus 1	see above
361	P. Salutaris: (<i>PLRE</i> I: 278) Entrechius 1	native of Nicaea, studied in Athens; later: in 362–4 v.c. <i>praeses</i>
<i>Consularis of Cyprus</i>		
351–4	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 761) Quirinus	earlier: <i>praeses Lyciae</i> and <i>praeses/</i> <i>consularis</i> of Pamphylia
354/7	(<i>PLRE</i> I: 479) Bassidius Lauricius	
360/3	Flavius Faus(t..)	

This table is based on the results of *PLRE* I and of the literature discussed in [Chapter 6](#).

APPENDIX F

NOTES ON THE PRAETORSHIPS OF 361

In this appendix I discuss a number of problems raised by several lacunae in the preserved version of *CTh* 6.4.13, Constantius' ruling on the praetorships in Constantinople from 361.

The text reads (trans. Project Volterra):

IDEM A. AD SENATVM.

Ex quinque praetoribus, qui sollem[niter] designati editionem celebrare consuerunt, tr[es nu]mero editionis necessitati et populi uoluptatibus dent, duo uero argentum inferant eiusdem urbis [fabri]cis provida ratione profuturum. Namque Constan[tini]ana, quae prior es<t>, ita deputari fabricis deb[et], ut mille] libras argenti praetor expendat; Flauialis uero, [quae] tertia est, quingentas operibus eiusdem urbis exh[ibeat.] DAT. V NON. MAI. GEPHYRAE TAVRO ET FLORENTIO CONSS.

The same Augustus to the Senate

Of the five praetors who have been formally nominated and customarily administer the giving of games, three are to devote their attention to the necessity of the games-giving and to the amusements of the people; but two of the praetors are to contribute silver, so that by a prudent plan it may profit the public works of this same city [Constantinople]. For the Constan[tini]an praetorship, which is first, must be so assigned to the public works that its praetor spends [one thousand] pounds of silver, but the Flavian Praetorship, which is the third, is to contribute five hundred pounds to the public works of this same city. Given on the fifth day before the Nones of May at Gephyra, in the consulship of Taurus and Florentius.

The law thus has several lacunae regarding the price of the first praetorship as well as its name. As regards price, only that of the third praetorship, 500 pounds of silver, is preserved. In the quoted edition, Mommsen suggests inserting *mille*, that is, 1,000 pounds of silver, in the lacuna as the price of the first praetorship. This looks convincing: a later law, *CTh* 6.4.25 from 384, which also discusses the praetorships at Constantinople,

holds that the first praetorship had been set at 1,000 pounds of silver in the past. If so, on the model provided by this later law, the following ratios may be established for 361: the first praetor had to furnish 1,000 pounds of silver, the second praetor 750 pounds of silver, the third praetor 500 pounds of silver, and fourth and fifth (?) praetors 250 pounds silver (note, however, that in 384 the third praetor only had to contribute 450 pounds of silver and not 500 as in 361). The praetorship was thus expensive: in the conversion rates at the time, this would amount to 5,000/4,000 solidi, 3,750/3,000 solidi, 2,500/2,000 solidi and 1,250/1,000 solidi.¹ However, given the degree of uncertainty in such attempts to reconstruct historic conversion rates, these figures must remain hypothetical. Indeed, the law itself may suggest that other conversion rates should be applied in 361, for otherwise the fines imposed on the negligent provincial governors (10 pounds of gold) would perhaps be disproportionately high: 10 pounds of gold equalled about 7,200 solidi under Constantine.

The title of the first praetorship is another problem. Again, there is a lacuna in the text, and the title of the first praetor is not entirely preserved: Constan[...]*ana*. Based on the evidence from *CTh* 6.4.25, where a Constantinian praetor is mentioned, this has been emended to Constan[tini]*ana*. This looks convincing, given that what seem to be missing here are around four to five letters. The other, more unlikely, possibility is that the praetorship was called Constan[ti]*ana* after Constantius, a title that is preserved in the later ruling. Still, what is interesting here is that Constantius reordered the title of the praetors in Constantinople when he introduced two new praetorships in 361: in 340 the Flavian had been the first praetorship and the Constantinian the second (see *CTh* 6.4.5). In 361 the Flavian praetor now ranks third, probably below the Constantian and the Constantinian ones. The titles of the two remaining praetorships mentioned in our law, *CTh* 6.4.13, may be inferred from *CTh* 6.4.25, where the fourth praetor is called Triumphant

¹ Conversion rates: Hendy (1989) 465–6.

Appendix F

(in *CTh* 6.4.5 this was the third praetor), and the fifth is called Roman. The new titles of the praetors thus nicely establish the character of the senate: it was the child of Constantine and the achievement of Constantius, remaining representative of the triumphant Flavian dynasty, and an image of Rome.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I Primary Sources

- AE* *L'Année épigraphique* (1888–), Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Amm. Ammianus Marcellinus *Res gestae*, ed. Seyfarth (1978) *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, 2 vols, Leipzig, Teubner. English trans. by J. C. Rolfe (1935–9) *Ammianus Marcellinus*, 3 vols, Loeb Classical Library 331, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Athan. *Apol. c. Ar* Athanasius of Alexandria, *Apologia contra Arianos* (= *Apologia Secunda*), ed. in H. G. Opitz (1935–41) *Athanasius: Werke* II.1, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Athan. *Apol. Const.* Athanasius of Alexandria, *Apologia ad Constantium*, ed. in H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, and A. von Stockhausen (2006) *Athanasius: Werke* II.8, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Athan. *Apol. Arianos* Athanasius of Alexandria, *Apologia contra Arianos*, ed. in H. G. Opitz (1935–41) *Athanasius: Werke* II.1, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Athan. *De Syn.* Athanasius of Alexandria, *De Synodis*, ed. in H. G. Opitz (1935–41) *Athanasius: Werke* II.1, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Athan. *Hist. Ar.* Athanasius of Alexandria, *Historia Arianorum*, ed. in H. G. Opitz (1935–41) *Athanasius: Werke* II.1, Berlin, de Gruyter. English trans. by R. Flower (2016) *Imperial Invectives Against Constantius II. Athanasius of Alexandria, Hilary of Poitiers and Lucifer of Cagliari*, trans. with Introduction and Commentary by Richard Flower. TTH 67, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Aur. Vict. *Caes.* Aurelius Victor, *Caesares*, ed. F. Pichlmayr (1961) *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de Caesaribus*, Leipzig. English trans. by H. W. Bird (1994) *Liber de Caesaribus of Sextus Aurelius Victor*, trans. with an Introduction and Commentary, TTH 17, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Chron. Pasch.* *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf (1832) *Chronicon Paschale, Leipzig*. English trans. by M. and M. Whitby (1989) *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*, trans. with Introduction and Notes, TTH 7, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, ed. Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (1862–), Berlin, Reimer.

Bibliography

- CJ Codex Justinianus, ed. in P. Krüger (1877) *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. 2, *Codex Iustinianus*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- C. Porph. *De Them.* Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De Thematis*, ed. in A. Pertusi (1952) *Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De Thematis*, Studi e Testi 160, Vatican City, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana.
- CLRE Bagnall, R. S., Cameron, A., Schwartz, S. R., and Worp, K. A. (1987) *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta, GA, American Philological Association.
- CTh *Theodosian Code*, ed. in T. Mommsen et al. (1904/1954) *Codex Theodosianus. Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis: et Leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- Demegoria Constantii* see Themistius, *Orationes*
- Eun. Eunapius, *Fragments*, ed. and English trans. in R. C. Blockley (1981) *The Fragmented Classicizing Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, with Text, Translation, and Notes, Liverpool, Cairns.
- Eus. HE Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. in T. Mommsen and E. Schwartz (1903–9) *Eusebius Werke*, 2, *Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Eus. V. *Const.* Eusebius of Caesarea, *De Vita Constantini*, ed. in F. Winkelmann (2008) *Eusebius Werke*. 1/1. *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, Rrv. edn, Berlin, de Gruyter. English trans. by A. Cameron and E. G. Hall (2001) *Life of Constantine. Eusebius. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, London, Clarendon Press.
- Eutr. Eutropius, *Breviarium*, ed. in F. Rühl (1919) *Eutropii Breviarium ab urbe condita*, Leipzig, Teubner. English trans. by W. H. Bird (1994) *The Breviarium Ab Urbe Condita of Eutropius, the Right Honourable Secretary of State for General Petitions: Dedicated to Lord Valens Gothicus Maximus and Perpetual Emperor*, trans. with an Introduction and Commentary, TTH 14, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Exp. tot. mundi* *Expositio Totius Mundi et Gentium*, ed. and French trans. in J. Rougé (1966) *Expositio Totius Mundi et Gentium*, SC 124, Paris, Éditions du Cerf.
- Festus Festus, *Breviarium*, ed. and English trans. in J. W. Eadie (1967) *The Breviarium of Festus. A Critical Edition with Historical Commentary*, London, Athlone.
- Greg. Naz. Or. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orationes*, ed. in J. Mossay (1980) *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 20–23*, SC 270, Paris, Éditions du Cerf.
- Hil. *De Syn.* Hilary of Poitiers, *De Synodis*, ed. in J.-P. Migne (1845) *Sancti Hilarii Pictaviensis Episcopi Opera Omnia*, 2. *Patrologia Latina* 10, Paris, Vrayet.
- Him. Or. Himerius, *Orationes*, ed. in A. Colonna (1951) *Himerii Declamationes et orationes cum deperditarum fragmentis*, Rome,

Bibliography

- Publ. Officina Polygr. English trans. by J. Penella (2007) *Man and the Word: The Orations of Himerius*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- IK Ephesos* H. Wankel (1979) *Die Inschriften von Ephesos Teil Ia Nr. 1–47 (Texte)*, Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 11.1, Bonn, Habelt.
- ILS* H. Dessau, ed. (1892–1916) *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, 5 vols, Berlin, Weidmann.
- Itin. Alex.* *Itinerarium Alexandri*, ed., commentary and Italian trans. in R. Tabacco (2000) *Itinerarium Alexandri. Testo, apparato critico, introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Università degli Studi di Torino, Fondo di studi Parini-Chirio. Filologia, ns 1, Florence, Olschki. English trans. in I. Davies (1999) 'Alexander's itinerary. An English translation', *Ancient History Bulletin* 12: 29–54.
- Jer. Chron.* Jerome, *Chronicon*, ed. in R. Helm and U. Treu (1984) *Die Chronik des Hieronymus. Eusebius Werke* 7, 3rd edn, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- John. Lyd. De Mag.* John Lydus, *De magistratibus*, ed. and French trans. in J. Schamp (2006) *Jean le Lydien, Des magistratures de l'état romain. Texte établi, traduit et commenté*, 2 vols, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Jul. Ep. ad Ath.* Julian, *Epistula ad Athenienses*, ed. and French trans. in J. Bidez (1932–64) *L'Empereur Julien Oeuvres complètes*, 2 vols in 4, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Jul. Ep. ad Them.* Julian, *Epistula ad Themistium*, ed. and French trans. in J. Bidez (1932–64) *L'Empereur Julien Oeuvres complètes*, 2 vols in 4, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Jul. Misop.* Julian, *Misopogon*, ed. and French trans. in J. Bidez (1932–64) *L'Empereur Julien Oeuvres complètes*, 2 vols in 4, Paris, Les Belles Lettres. English trans. in W. C. F. Wright (1992) *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, vol. 2. Reprint. Loeb Classical Library 29, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Jul. Or. 1* Julian, *Orationes*, ed. and French trans. in J. Bidez (1932–64) *L'Empereur Julien Oeuvres complètes*, 2 vols in 4, Paris, Les Belles Lettres. English trans. in W. C. F. Wright (1980) *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, vol. 1. Reprint. Loeb Classical Library 13, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Jul. Or. 2* Julian, *Orationes*, ed. and French trans. in J. Bidez (1932–64) *L'Empereur Julien Oeuvres complètes*, 2 vols in 4, Paris, Les Belles Lettres. English trans. in W. C. F. Wright (1980) *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, vol. 1. Reprint. Loeb Classical Library 13, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Lact. De mort. pers.* Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, ed. and English trans. in J. L. Creed (1984) *Lactantius: De Mortibus Persecutorum*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Bibliography

- Lib. *arg. D.* Libanius, *Argumenta orationum Demosthenicarum*, ed. in R. Foerster (1903–27) *Libanius: Opera*, 10, Leipzig, Teubner series.
- Lib. *Ep.* Libanius, *Epistulae*, ed. in R. Foerster (1903–27) *Libanius: Opera*, Leipzig, Teubner. Selected letters are trans. into English by A. F. Norman (1992) *Libanius: Autobiography and Selected Letters*, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library 478/479, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, and S. Bradbury (2004) *Selected Letters of Libanius: From the Age of Constantius and Julian*, trans. with an Introduction and Notes by Scott Bradbury, TTH 41, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Lib. *Or. 1* Libanius, *Orationes*, in R. Foerster (1903–27) *Libanius: Opera*. Leipzig, Teubner series. English trans. in A. F. Norman (1992) *Libanius: Autobiography and Selected Letters*, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library 478/479, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Lib. *Or. 42* Libanius, *Orationes*, in R. Foerster (1903–27) *Libanius: Opera*, Leipzig, Teubner. English trans. in A. F. Norman (2000) *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius*, trans. with an Introduction, TTH 34, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Lib. *Or. 59* Libanius, *Orationes*, in R. Foerster (1903–27) *Libanius: Opera*, Leipzig, Teubner. English trans. by M. H. Dodgeon (1996) ‘Libanius, Oratio LIX’ in S. Lieu and D. Montserrat (eds), *From Constantine to Julian. Pagan and Byzantine Views: A Source History*, London, Routledge: 164–209.
- Lib. *Pont.* *Liber pontificalis*, ed. and Franch trans. by L. Duchesne (1955) *Liber pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*, 2 vols, Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d’Athènes et de Rome. 2nd series, 3. Reprint. Vol. 3, *Additions et corrections, publiées par C. Vogel, avec l’histoire du Liber pontificalis depuis l’édition de L. Duchesne, une bibliographie et des tables générales*, Paris, Thorin. English trans. by R. Davis (1989) *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber pontificalis). The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, TTH 6, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- LSA Last Statues of Antiquity Project, AHRC funded project at the University of Oxford. Principal directors: R. R. Smith and B. Ward-Perkins. Accessible at: <http://laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk>.
- Luc. *De s. Ath.* Lucifer of Cagliari, *Quia absentem nemo debet iudicare nec damnare sive De Athanasio Liber I*, ed. in G. F. Diercks (1978) *Luciferi Calaritanani opera quae supersunt*, CCSL 8, Turnhout, Brepols.
- Malal. *Chron.* John Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. L. Dindorf (1831), Bonn. English trans. in E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, R. Scott and B. Croke (1986) *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, Melbourne, Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.
- Optatian. *Carm.* Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius, *Carmines*, ed. in G. Polara (1973) *Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius: Carmina*, 2 vols, Turin, Paravia.

Bibliography

- Origo Const.* Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini*, ed. and German trans. in I. König (1987) *Origo Constantini. Anonymus Valesianus*, 1, *Text und Kommentar*, Trier, Verlag Trierer Historische Forschungen.
- P. Abinn.* *The Abinnaeus Archive*, ed. in H. I. Bell et al. (1962) Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Pan. Lat.* *Panegyrici Latini*, ed. and English trans. in R. A. B. Mynors (1964) *XII Panegyrici Latini*, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- PCBE* J. Desmulliez et al. (eds) (1999–2000) *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas Empire*, 2, *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne*, Paris, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Philost.* Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. in J. Bidez and F. Winkelmann (1981) *Philostorgius: Kirchengeschichte*, GCS, 3rd edn, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Phot.* B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerink (eds) (1983–8) *Photii patriarchae Constantinopolitani epistulae et amphilochia*, 6 vols, Leipzig, Teubner.
- P. Lond.* F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell (eds) (1893–1917) *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, London, British Museum.
- PLRE I* A. H. M. Jones, G. R. Martindale, and J. Morris (eds) (1971) *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 1, *A.D. 260–395*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- PLRE II* A. H. M. Jones, G. R. Martindale, and J. Morris (eds) (1980) *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 2, *A.D. 395–527*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- P. Oxy.* B. P. Grenfell et al. (eds) (1898–) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London, Egypt Exploration Society for the British Academy.
- RIC VII* H. V. Sutherland and R. A. G. Carson (eds) (1966) *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. 7 by M. Bruun, *Constantine and Licinius, A.D. 313–337*, London, Spink.
- RIC VIII* H. V. Sutherland and R. A. G. Carson (eds) (1966) *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. 8 by M. Bruun, *The Family of Constantine I, A.D. 337–364*, London, Spink.
- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (1923–) Amsterdam, Gieben.
- SIG* W. Dittenberger (ed.) (1915–24) *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Hildesheim, Olms.
- Soc.* Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. in G. C. Hansen (1995) *Sokrates: Kirchengeschichte*, GCS NF I, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Soz.* Sozomenos, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. in G. C. Hansen (2004) *Sozomenos: Kirchengeschichte*, *Fontes christiani* 73, 4 vols, Turnhout, Brepols.
- Symm. Ep.* Symmachus, *Epistulae*, ed. and French trans. in J.-P. Callu (1972–2002) *Symmache. Lettres, Texte établi, traduit et commenté*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres. English trans. of the first book of letters in M. R. Salzman and M. Roberts (2001) *The Letters of Symmachus: Book 1*, trans. by M. R. Salzman and M. Roberts; general introduction and

Bibliography

- commentary by M. R. Salzman, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 30, Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature.
- Symm. *Or.* Symmachus, Orationes, ed. in O. Seeck (1883/2001) *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- Symm. *Rel.* Symmachus, Relationes, ed. and English trans. in R. H. Barrow (1973) *Prefect and Emperor. The Relationes of Symmachus, A.D. 384*, Text with trans. and notes, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Them. *Or.* Themistius, Orationes 1–4, ed. in W. Dindorf (1961) *Themistius. Orationes*, Leipzig, Teubner. Selected trans. in P. J. Heather and D. Moncur (2001) *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*, TTH 36, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Theod. Theodoret, Historia Ecclesiastica, ed. in L. Parmentier and G. C. Hansen (1998) *Theodoret: Kirchengeschichte*, 3rd edn, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Zon. Zonaras, Epitomae historiarum libri XIII–XVIII, ed. in T. Büttner-Wobst (1897) *Ioannis Zonarae Epitomae Historiarum libri XIII–XVIII*, Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae, Bonn, Weber Verlag.
- Zos. Zosimus, Historia Nova, ed. and French trans. in F. Paschoud (2000) *Zosime. Histoire Nouvelle*. Ed. and trans. by F. Paschoud, 2nd edn, 5 vols, Paris, Les Belles Lettres. English trans. by R. T. Ridley (1982) *Zosimus: New History*, Byzantina Australiensia 2, Canberra, University of Sydney.

II Secondary Sources

- Abdy, R. (2012) 'Tetrarchy and the house of Constantine' in W. E. Metcalf (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 584–600.
- Adams, J. N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Alföldi, A. (1943) *Die Kontorniaten. Ein verkanntes Propagandamittel der stadtrömischen heidnischen Aristokratie in ihrem Kampfe gegen das christliche Kaisertum*, Budapest, Magyar Numizmatikai Társulat.
- (1947) 'On the foundation of Constantinople: A few notes', *JRS* 37: 10–16.
- (1948) *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, trans. H. Mattingly, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Aliquot, J. (2010) 'Laodicée-sur-mer et les fondations de l'empereur Constance', *Chiron* 40: 61–76.
- Arce, J. (1988) *Funus Imperatorum. Los funerales de los emperadores romanos*, Madrid, Alianza.
- Arnheim, M. T. W. (1972) *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bibliography

- Auinger, J., and Rathmayr, E. (2007) 'Statuenausstattung der Thermen und Nymphäen in Ephesos' in F. A. Bauer and C. Witschel (eds) *Statuen in der Spätantike*, Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag: 237–67.
- Bagnall, R. S., Cameron, A., Schwartz, S. R., and Worp, K. A. (1987) *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta, GA, American Philological Association.
- Baldus, H. R. (1984) 'Constantius et Constans Augusti. Darstellungen des kaiserlichen Brüderpaares auf Prägungen der Jahre 340–350 n. Chr.', *JNG* 34: 77–106, tables 11–114.
- Banaji, J. (2007) *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity. Gold, Labour, and Aristocratic Dominance*, 2nd edn, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Barceló, P. A. (1999) 'Caesar Gallus und Constantius II. Ein gescheitertes Experiment?', *Acta Classica* 42: 23–34.
- (2004) *Constantius II. und seine Zeit. Die Anfänge des Staatskirchentums*, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta.
- Bardill, J. (2004) *Brickstamps of Constantinople*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- (2012) *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Barnes, T. D. (1975a) 'Publius Optatianus Porphyrius', *AJPh* 96.2: 173–86.
- (1975b) 'Two senators under Constantine', *JRS* 65: 40–9.
- (1978) 'Emperors and bishops, A.D. 324–44. Some problems', *AJAH* 3: 53–75.
- (1980) 'Imperial chronology, A.D. 337–350', *Phoenix* 34: 160–6.
- (1981) *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge, MA/London, Harvard University Press.
- (1982) *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, Cambridge, MA/London, Harvard University Press.
- (1987a) 'Himerius and the fourth century', *CPh* 82: 206–24.
- (1987b) 'Regional prefectures' in J. Straub (ed.) *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1984/1985*, Bonn, Habelt Verlag: 13–23.
- (1989a) 'Christians and pagans in the reign of Constantius' in A. Dihle (ed.) *L'église et l'empire au IVe siècle*, Sur l'Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt 34, Vandoeuvres/Geneva, Fondation Hardt: 301–37.
- (1989b) 'Structure and chronology in Ammianus, book 14', *HSCPh* 92: 413–22.
- (1992) 'Praetorian prefects', *ZPE* 94: 249–60.
- (1993) *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, MA/London, Harvard University Press.
- (1994) 'The religious affiliations of consuls and prefects, 317–361' in Barnes, *From Eusebius to Augustine: Selected Papers 1982–1993*, Aldershot, Variorum, paper VII.
- (1995) 'Statistics and the conversion of the Roman aristocracy', *JRS* 85: 134–47.

Bibliography

- (1996) 'Emperors, panegyrics, prefects, provinces and palaces (284–317)', *JRA* 9: 532–52.
- (1998) *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*, Ithaca, NY/London, Cornell University Press.
- (2002) 'From toleration to repression. The evolution of Constantine's religious policies', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21: 189–208.
- (2009) 'Was there a Constantinian revolution?', *JLA* 2.2: 374–84.
- (2011) *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*, London, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Barnish, S. J. B. (1989) 'A note on the *collatio glebalis*', *Historia* 38: 254–6.
- Bassett, S. (2004) *Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bastien, P. (1988) *Monnaie et donativa au Bas-Empire*, Wetteren, Éditions Numismatique Romaine.
- Bauer, F. A. (1996) *Stadt, Platz und Denkmal in der Spätantike. Untersuchungen zu den Ausstattungen des öffentlichen Raums in den spätantiken Städten Rom, Konstantinopel und Ephesos*, Mainz, von Zabern Verlag.
- (2003) 'Statuen hoher Würdenträger im Stadtbild Konstantinopels', *ByzZ* 96: 493–513.
- (2007) 'Virtuelle Statuensammlungen' in F. A. Bauer and C. Witschel (eds) *Statuen in der Spätantike*. Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag: 79–109.
- Beard, M. (2007) *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge, MA/London, Harvard University Press.
- Beck, H.-G. (1973) 'Großstadt-Probleme: Konstantinopel vom 4.–6. Jahrhundert' in H.-G. Beck (ed.) *Studien zur Frühgeschichte Konstantinopels*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 14, Munich, Institut für Byzantinistik und Neugriechische Philologie: 1–26.
- Begass, C. (2016) 'Property and power of the senatorial aristocracy of the eastern Roman empire in the fifth and sixth centuries', *JLA* 9.2: 462–82.
- Benoist, S. (2005) *Rome, le prince et la cite. Pouvoir impérial et cérémonies publiques (Ier siècle av.–début du IVe siècle apr. J.-C.)*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Béranger, J. (1981) Review of Vogler, C. (1979) *Constance II et l'administration impériale*, *Strasbourg, AECR, MH* 38: 188.
- Berger, A. (1987) 'Die Altstadt von Byzanz in vorjustinianischer Zeit', *Varia II. Poikila Byzantina* 6: 9–30.
- (1995) 'Die Senate von Konstantinopel', *Boreas* 18: 131–42.
- (2007) 'Konstantinopel, die erste christliche Metropole?' in H. Schlange-Schöninghen (ed.) *Konstantin und das Christentum. Neue Wege der Forschung*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: 204–15. Reprinted from: G. Brands and H.-G. Severin (2003) *Die spätantike Stadt und ihre Christianisierung. Symposium vom 14.–16. 02. 2000 in Halle/Saale*, Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag: 63–72.
- Bernandi, J. (1984) 'Nouvelles perspectives sur la famille de Grégoire de Nazianze', *Vigilae Christianae* 38: 352–9.

Bibliography

- Beyeler, M. (2011) *Geldgeschenke des Kaisers. Studien zur Chronologie, zu den Empfängern und zu den Gegenständen der kaiserlichen Vergabungen im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Beynast, A. de (2010) 'Domitius Zenophilus, les Actus Silvestri et la province d'Asia', *AntTard* 18: 199–209.
- Bihain, E. (1973) 'L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la vision de la croix (BHG³ 413)', *Byzantion* 43: 264–96.
- Bleckmann, B. (1994) 'Constantina, Vetranio und Gallus Caesar', *Chiron* 24: 29–68.
- (1996) *Konstantin der Große*, Hamburg, Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.
- (1999a) 'Die Schlacht von Mursa und die zeitgenössische Deutung eines spätantiken Bürgerkrieges' in H. Brandt (ed.) *Gedeutete Realität. Krisen, Wirklichkeiten, Interpretationen (3.–6. Jh. n. Chr.)*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 134, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 47–101.
- (1999b) 'Decentius, Bruder oder Cousin des Magnentius?', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 2: 85–7.
- (2003a) 'Der Bürgerkrieg zwischen Constantin II. und Constans (340 n. Chr.)', *Historia* 52: 225–50.
- (2003b) 'Gallus, César de l'Orient?' in F. Chausson and É. Wolff (eds) *Consuetudinis Amor. Fragments d'histoire romaine (IIe–VIe siècles) offerts à Jean-Pierre Callu* (= Saggi di storia antica 19), Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider: 45–56.
- (2011) 'Okzident gegen Orient. Die Kämpfe zwischen Konstantin und Licinius' in K. Ehling and G. Weber (eds) *Konstantin der Große. Zwischen Sol und Christus*, Darmstadt/Mainz, von Zabern Verlag: 89–93.
- Bleckmann, B., and Schneider, H. (2007) *Eusebius von Caesarea. De vita Constantini. Über das Leben Konstantins*, *Fontes Christiani* 83, Brepols, Turnout.
- Blockley, R. C. (1969) 'Internal self-policing in the later Roman administration. Some evidence from Ammianus Marcellinus', *Classica et Medievalia* 30: 403–19.
- (1972) 'Constantius Gallus and Julian as Caesars of Constantius II', *Latomus* 31: 433–68.
- (1980) 'Constantius II and his generals' in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, 2, Collection Latomus 168, Brussels, Peeters: 467–86.
- (1988) 'Ammianus Marcellinus on the Persian invasion of A.D. 359', *Phoenix* 42: 244–60.
- (1998) 'Warfare and diplomacy' in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, *The Late Empire, A.D. 337–425*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 411–36.
- Boak, A. E. R. (1924) 'The master of offices in the later Roman and Byzantine empires' in A. E. R. Boak and J. E. Dunlap (eds) *Two Studies in Later Roman and Byzantine Administration*, *Studies Humanistic Series* 14, New York, University of Michigan: 1–160.

Bibliography

- den Boeft, J., den Hengst, D., and Teitler, H. C. (eds) (1992) *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus. Proceedings of the Colloquium (Amsterdam, 26.–28. August 1991)*, Amsterdam/New York, North-Holland Publishing Co.
- Bon, A. (1951) *Le Péloponnèse byzantin jusqu'en 1204*, Bibliothèque byzantine 1, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bonamente, G. (1988) 'Apoteosi e imperatori cristiani' in G. Bonamente and A. Nestori (eds) *I cristiani e l'impero nel IV secolo*, Macerata, Università degli Studi di Macerata: 107–42.
- Bonfils, G. de (1981) *Il Comes et Quaestor nell'età della dinastia costantiniana*, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà giuridica dell'Università di Bari 62, Naples, Jovene.
- (1983) 'Alcune riflessioni dalla legislazione di Costanzo II e Costante' in *Atti del V Convegno dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana*, Naples, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane: 299–309.
- Börm, H. (2010) 'Herrscher und Eliten in der Spätantike' in H. Börm and J. Wiesehöfer (eds) *Commutatio et Contentio. Studies in the Late Roman, Sasanian, and Early Islamic Near East in Memory of Zeev Rubin*, Düsseldorf, Wellem Verlag: 159–98.
- Boulay, T., and Northrup, S. (2016) 'Vineyard ownership. A habitus of power? The roots of land tenure and the culture of wine-making among a new political class, from Constantine to Julian', *JLA* 9.2: 415–35.
- Bowersock, G. W. (1978) *Julian the Apostate*, London and Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Bradbury, S. (1994) 'Constantine and the problem of antipagan legislation in the fourth century', *CPh* 89: 120–39.
- (1995) 'Julian's pagan revival and blood sacrifice', *Phoenix* 49: 331–56.
- (2000) 'A sophistic prefect. Anatolius of Berytus in the letters of Libanius', *CPh* 95: 172–86.
- (2004) *Selected Letters of Libanius. From the Age of Constantius and Julian*. Trans. with an introduction and notes by Scott Bradbury, TTH 41, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Brandes, W. (2014) 'Der Nika-Aufstand, Senatorenfamilien und Justinians Bauprogramm' in M. Meier and S. Patzold (eds) *Chlodwigs Welt. Organisation von Herrschaft um 500*, Roma Aeterna 3, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 239–65.
- Bransbourg, G. (2008) 'Fiscalité impériale et finances municipales au IVE siècle', *AntTard* 16: 255–96.
- Brélat, C. (2004) 'Le recours au Latin dans les documents officiels émis par les cités d'Asie Mineure' in F. Biville et al. (eds) *Bilinguisme gréco-latin et épigraphie. Actes du colloque organisé à l'Université Lumière-Lyon 2 Maison de l'Orient de la Méditerranée-Jean Pouilloux UMR 5189 Hisoma et JE 2409 Romanitas, le 17, 18 et 19 mai 2004*. Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée 37, Lyon, Université de Lyon: 169–94.

Bibliography

- (2014) *Corpus d'inscriptions grecques et latines de Philippe, II.1, La colonie romaine. La vie publique de la colonie*, Études épigraphiques 6, Athens/Paris, École française d'Athènes.
- Brennecke, H. C. (1984) *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des Arianischen Streites (337–361)*, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Brown, P. (1971) *The World of Late Antiquity. From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad*, London, Thames & Hudson.
- (2000) 'The study of elites in late antiquity', *Arethusa* 33.3: 321–46.
- (2012) *Through the Eye of a Needle. Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 AD*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Bruun, P. (1954) 'The consecration coins of Constantine the Great', *Arctos* 1: 19–31.
- Burgess, R. W. (2008) 'The summer of blood. The "great massacre" of 337 and the promotion of the sons of Constantine', *DOP* 62: 5–51.
- Cabouret, B. (2000) *Libanios. Lettres aux hommes de son temps, Lettres choisies, traduites et annotées*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Callu, J.-P. (1986) 'Aspects du quadrimestre monétaire. La périodicité des différents de 294 à 375', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité* 98.1: 165–216
- (1987) "'Miroir des Princes". Le "basilikos" libanien de 348', *Gerion* 5: 133–52.
- (1992) 'La dyarchie constantinide (340–350). Les signes d'évolution' in M. Christol, S. Demougin, Y. Duval, C. Lepelley and L. Pietri (eds) *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C.. Actes de la table ronde autour de l'œuvre d'André Chastagnol (Paris, 20–21 janvier 1989)*, Paris, École française de Rome: 39–68.
- Calvet-Sebasti, M.-A. (1995) *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 6–12*, Introduction, critical edn and trans. by Marie-Ange Calvet-Sebasti, SC 405, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Cameron, Alan (1976) *Circus Factions*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- (1989) 'Biondo's Ammianus. Constantius and Hormisdas at Rome', *HSCPh* 93: 423–36.
- (1996) 'Orfitus and Constantius. A note of Roman gold-glasses', *JRA* 9: 295–301.
- (1999) 'The antiquity of the Symmachi', *Historia* 48: 477–505.
- (2002) 'The funeral of Junius Bassus', *ZPE* 139: 288–92.
- (2011) *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, Alan, Long, J., and Sherry, L. (1993) *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 19, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Cameron, Averil (2005) 'The reign of Constantine the Great' in A. K. Bowman, P. A. Garnsey and A. Cameron (eds) *Cambridge Ancient*

Bibliography

- History*, 12, *The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193–337*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 90–109.
- Cameron and Hall (1999) = Cameron, Averil and Hall, S. G. (1999) *Eusebius, Life of Constantine*, trans. with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Campbell, S. (1988) *The Mosaics of Antioch*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Carrié, J.-M. (1975) 'Les distributions alimentaires dans les cités de l'empire Romain tardif', *MEFRA* 87: 995–1101.
- Carrié, J.-M., and Rouselle, A. (1999) *L'empire romain en mutation des Sévères à Constantin 192–337*, Nouvelle histoire de l'Antiquité 10, Paris, Éditions du Seuil.
- Carson, R. A. G. (1990) *Coins of the Roman Empire*, London, Routledge.
- Casella, M. (2007) 'Les spectacles à Antioche d'après Libanius', *AntTard* 15: 99–102.
- Cayla, J.-B. (1997) 'Bassidius Lauricius gouverneur de Chypre? Une nouvelle hypothèse à propos de la restauration d'un monument incendié à Paphos', *CCEC* 27: 71–6.
- Cecconi, G. A. (1994) *Governo imperiale e élites dirigenti nell' Italia tardoantica*, Como, Edizioni New Press.
- (1996) 'Aviano Simmaco, Constante e l'andamento delle carriere senatorie nel tardo imperio (in margine all'interpretazione di AE 1988, 217)', *SDHI* 62: 343–55.
- (1998) 'I governatori delle province italiane', *AntTard* 6: 149–79.
- Chantraine, H. (1992a) *Die Nachfolgeordnung Constantins des Großen*, Stuttgart, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.
- (1992b) 'Konstantinopel – von Zweitem Rom zum Neuen Rom', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 43: 3–15.
- Charron, A., and Heijmans, M. (2001) 'L'obélisque du cirque d'Arles', *JRA* 14: 373–80.
- Chastagnol, A. (1958) 'Observations sur le consulat suffect et la préture du Bas-Empire', *Revue Historique* 219: 211–53.
- (1959) 'La carrière du Proconsul d'Afrique M. Aurelius Consius Quartus', *Lybica* 7: 191–203.
- (1960) *La préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- (1962) *Les fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire*, Paris, Nouvelles Éditions Latines.
- (1968a) *L'Album municipal de Timgad*. *Antiquitas* 3(22), Bonn, Habelt Verlag.
- (1968b) 'Les préfets du prétoire de Constantin', *REA* 70: 321–52.
- (1976) 'Remarques sur les sénateurs orientaux au IV^{ème} siècle', *Acta Ant Hung* 24: 341–56.

Bibliography

- (1983) 'La législation du clarissimat féminin de Sévère Alexandre à la fin du IV^e siècle' in *Atti dell' Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana, V Convegno Internazionale*, Naples, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane: 255–62.
- (1992) *Le sénat romain à l'époque impériale. Recherches sur la composition de l'Assemblée et le statut de ses membres*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Chausson, F. (2007) *Stemmata aurea: Constantin, Justine, Théodose. Revendications généalogiques et idéologie impériale au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C.*, Rome, L'Erma' di Bretschneider.
- (2016) 'Pour une histoire des patrimoines des sénateurs orientaux en Occident (Rome, Italie, Sicile)' in F. Lerouxel and A.-V. Pont (eds) *Propriétaires et citoyens dans l'Orient romain*, Scripta antiqua 84, Bordeaux, Éditions Ausonius.
- Chenault, R. R. (2008) 'Rome without emperors. The revival of a senatorial city in the fourth century CE', PhD University of Michigan: http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/60773/1/rchenaul_1.pdf
- (2012) 'Statues of senators in the Forum of Trajan and the Roman Forum in late antiquity', *JRS* 102: 103–12.
- Christol, M. (1986) *Essai sur l'évolution des carrières sénatoriales*, Paris, Nouvelles Éditions Latines.
- Classen, C. J. (1988) 'Nes spuens aut os aut nasum tergens vel fricans (Amm. 16.10.10)', *Rheinischen Museum* 131: 177–86.
- Clauss, M. (1980) *Der magister officiorum in der Spätantike (4.–6. Jahrhundert): das Amt und sein Einfluss auf die kaiserliche Politik*, Munich, C. H. Beck.
- Collinet, P. (1925) *Histoire de l'école de droit de Beyrouth, Études historiques sur le Droit de Justinien*, II, Paris, Société du Recueil Sirey.
- Corbier, P. (1999) *L'épigraphie latine*, 2nd edn, Paris, Éditions SEDES.
- Corcoran, S. (1993) 'Hidden from history. The legislation of Licinius' in J. Harries and I. Wood (eds) *The Theodosian Code*, Ithaca, NY, Bristol Classical Press: 97–119.
- (1996) *The Empire of the Tetrarchs. Imperial Pronouncements and Government AD 284–324*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Corsten, T. (1997) *Die Inschriften von Laodikeia am Lykos*, 1, Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 49, Bonn, Habelt Verlag.
- Criboire, R. (2007) *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- (2009) 'The value of a good education. Libanius and public authority' in P. Rousseau (ed.) *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, London, Wiley Blackwell: 233–45.
- Croke and Harries (1982) = Croke, B., and Harries, J. (1982) *Religious Conflict in Fourth Century Rome: A Documentary Study*, Sydney, Sydney University Press.
- Cuneo, P. (1997) *La legislazione di Costantino II, Costanzo II et Costante (337–361)*, Milan, Guiffre.

Bibliography

- (2001) 'Unità e separazione. la legislazione dei Costantinidi' in G. Crifò, M. Sargenti and S. Giglio (eds) *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana. XIII Convegno internazionale in memoria di André Chastagnol*, Naples, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane: 165–74.
- Curran, J. (2000) *Pagan City and Christian Capital. Rome in the Fourth Century*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Daly, L. J. (1983) 'Themistius' refusal of a magistracy', *Byzantion* 53: 164–212.
- Dagron, G. (1968) *L'empire romain d'Orient au IV siècle et les traditions politiques de l'Hellénisme. Le témoignage de Thémistios*, Travaux et Mémoires 3, Paris, de Boccard.
- (1974) *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- (1976) *Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantine à la fin du Xe et XIe siècle*, Travaux et Mémoires 6, Paris, de Boccard: 177–216.
- (1984) 'Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine. Langue de culture et langue d'État' in G. Dagron (ed.) *La romanité chrétienne en Orient. Héritages et mutations*, London, Variorum Reprints: 23–56. Reprinted from: Dagron, G (1976), 177–216.
- Davenport, C. (2010) 'The building inscriptions from the fort at Udruh and Aelius Flavianus, Tetrarchic praeses of Palaestina', *JRS* 23: 349–57.
- (2013) 'The governors of Achaia under Diocletian and Constantine', *ZPE* 184: 225–34.
- (2015a) 'The prefecture of Caecilius Consulcius', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 52: 275–81.
- (2015b) 'Inscribing senatorial status and identity, A.D. 200–50' in A. B. Kuhn (ed.) *Social Status and Prestige in the Graeco-Roman World*, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 269–89.
- (2018) *A History of the Roman Equestrian Order*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, I. (1998) 'Alexander's itinerary. An English translation', *Ancient History Bulletin* 12: 29–54.
- Davis, R. (2000) *The Book of Pontiffs/Liber Pontificalis: The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, 2nd rev. edn, TTH 6, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Dearn, A. (2003) 'The coinage of Vetrano. Imperial representation and the memory of Constantine the Great', *Numismatic Chronicle* 163: 169–91.
- De Jonge, P. (1982) *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XIX*, trans. into English by P. de Waard-Dekking, Groningen, Brill.
- Deligiannakis, G. (2005) 'Two late-antique statues from ancient Messene', *ABSA* 100: 387–405.
- Delmaire, R. (1985) 'Remarques sur le chrysargyre et sa périodicité', *Revue numismatique* 6.27: 120–9.

Bibliography

- (1995) *Les institutions du Bas-Empire romain, de Constantin à Justinien, I, Les institutions civiles palatines*, Paris, Éditions du Cerf/ Éditions du CNRS.
- (1996) 'Quelques aspects de la vie municipale au Bas-Empire à travers les textes patristiques et hagiographiques' in A. Chastagnol, S. Demougin and C. Lepelley (eds) *Splendidissima Civitas. Études d'histoire romaine en hommage à François Jacques*, Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne: 40–8.
- (2003a) 'Jean Chrysostome et les brigands isauriens' in F. Chausson and E. Wolff (eds) '*Consuetudinis amor*'. *Fragments d'histoire romaine (II^e-IV^e siècles) offerts à Jean-Pierre Callu*, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider: 217–30.
- (2003b) 'La "damnatio memoriae" au Bas-Empire à travers les textes, la législation et les inscriptions', *Cahiers du Centre Gustave-Glotz* 14, Paris, Éditions de Boccard: 299–319.
- (2004) 'La législation sur les sacrifices au IV^e siècle. Un essai d'interprétation', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 82.3: 319–33.
- (2013) 'En marge de la prosopographie du Bas-Empire. La nomination des gouverneurs de provinces du IV^e au VI^e siècle' in S. Benoist and C. Hoet-van Cauvenberghe (eds) *La vie des autres. Histoire, prosopographie et biographie dans l'Empire Romain*, Villeneuve d'Ascq, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion: 131–50.
- Demougin, S. (2012) 'Histoire de famille en Italie du Sud' in R. Baudry and S. Destephen (eds) *La société romaine et ses élites. Hommage à Élisabeth Deniaux*, Paris, Picard: 129–41.
- Den Boeft, J., Drijvers, J. W., Den Hengst, D. and Teitler, H. C. (1995) *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus, Book 22*, Leiden, Brill.
- Den Boer, W. (1960) 'The emperor Silvanus and his army', *Acta Classica* 3: 105–9.
- De Salvo, L. (1992) *Economia privata e pubblici servizi nell'imperio romano. I corpora naviculariorum*, Messina, Samperi.
- Destephen, S. (2016) *Le voyage imperial dans l'Antiquité tardive. Des Balkans au Proche-Orient*, Paris, de Boccard.
- Devijver, H., and Waelkens, M. (1995) 'Roman inscriptions from the Upper Agora at Sagalassos' in M. Waelkens and J. Poblome (eds) *Sagalassos III. Report on the Fourth Excavation Campaign of 1993*, Leuven, Leuven University Press: 115–25.
- Devreker, J. (1982) 'Les Orientaux dans le sénat au 1^{er} siècle', *Latomus* 41: 492–516.
- Di Benedetto, F. (1998) 'Un codice epigrafico di Ciriaco ritrovato' in G. Paci and S. Sconocchia (eds) *Ciriaco d'Ancona e la cultura antiquaria dell'Umanesimo, Atti del convegno internazionale di studio. Ancona, 6–9 febbraio 1992*, Ancona, Diabasis: 147–67.

Bibliography

- Diefenbach, S. (2002) 'Zwischen Liturgie und "civilitas". Konstantinopel im 5. Jahrhundert und die Etablierung eines städtischen Kaisertums' in R. Warland (ed.) *Bildlichkeit und Bilort der Liturgie. Schauplätze in Spätantike, Byzanz und Mittelalter*, Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag: 21–49.
- (2007) *Römische Erinnerungsräume. Heiligenmemoria und kollektive Identitäten im Rom des 3. bis 5. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- (2015) 'A vain quest for unity. Creeds and political disintegration in the reign of Constantius II' in J. Wienand (ed.) *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 353–78.
- Dillon, J. N. (2015) 'The inflation of rank and privilege: Regulating precedence in the fourth century AD' in J. Wienand (ed.) *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 42–66.
- Dihle, A. (ed.) (1989) *L'église et l'empire au IV^{ème} siècle. Sept exposés suivis de discussions; 31 août–3 septembre 1987*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt 34, Vandoeuvres/Geneva, Fondation Hardt.
- Downey, G. (1961) *A History of Antioch in Syria*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- (1963) *Ancient Antioch*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Drijvers, J. W. (1992) *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of her Finding the True Cross*, Leiden, Brill.
- (1996) 'Ammianus Marcellinus 15.13.1. Some observations on the career and bilingualism of Strategius Musonianus', *CQ* 46: 532–7.
- (2011) 'Helena Augusta, the cross and the myth. Some new reflections', *Millennium* 8: 125–74.
- Drijvers, J. W., and Hunt, D. (eds) (1999) *The Late Roman World and its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London, Routledge.
- Drinkwater, J. F. (1983) 'The pagan underground, Constantius II's "secret service", and the usurpation of Julian the Apostate' in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Collection Latomus 3, Brussels, Peeters: 348–78.
- (2000) 'The revolt and ethnic origin of the usurper Magnentius (350–353) and the Rebellion of Vetricio (350)', *Chiron* 30: 131–57.
- Duncan-Jones, R. (1990) *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2016) *Power and Privilege in Roman Society*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Duval, Y. (1970) 'La venue à Rome de l'empereur Constance II en 357', *Caesardunum* 5: 299–304.
- Eck, W. (1974) Review of Arnheim, M. T. W. (1972) *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, *Gnomon* 46: 673–81.

Bibliography

- (2009) 'The presence, role and significance of Latin in the epigraphy and culture of the Roman Near East' in H. M. Cotton et al. (eds) *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 15–42.
- Edbrooke, R. O. (1975) 'Constantius II and Hormisdas in the Forum of Trajan', *Mnemosyne* 28: 412–17.
- (1976) 'The visit of Constantius II to Rome in 357 and its effect on the pagan Roman senatorial aristocracy', *AJPh* 97: 40–61.
- Ehling, K. (2001) 'Die Erhebung des Nepotianus in Rome im Juni 350 n. Chr. und sein Programm des urbs Roma Christiana', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 4: 141–58.
- Elia, F. (2002) 'Sui "privilegia urbis Constantinopolitanae"' in F. Elia (ed.) *Politica retorica e simbolismo de primato. Roma e Constantinopoli (secoli IV–VII). Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Catania, 4–7 ottobre 2001), Omaggio a Rosario Soraci, Leone S.R.L., I*, Catania: Università degli Studi di Catania: 79–105.
- Elliott, T. G. (1983) *I Ammianus Marcellinus and Fourth Century History*, Sarasota and Toronto, S. Stevens.
- Elsner, J. (1998) *Imperial Rome and Christian Triumph*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- (2000) 'From the culture of spolia to the cult of relics. The Arch of Constantine and the genesis of late antique forms', *PBSR* 68: 149–84.
- Engelmann, H., Knibbe, D., and R. Merkelbach (1980a) *Die Inschriften von Ephesos, III, Nr. 600–1000 (Repertorium)*, Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 13, Bonn, Habelt.
- (1980b) *Die Inschriften von Ephesos, IV, Nr. 1001–1445 (Repertorium)*, Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 14, Bonn, Habelt.
- Errington, R. M. (2000) 'Themistius and his emperors', *Chiron* 30: 861–904.
- (2006) *Roman Imperial Policy from Julian to Theodosius*, Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press.
- Evans-Grubbs, J. (1995) *Law and Family in Late Antiquity. The Emperor Constantine's Marriage Legislation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Fatouros, G., and Krischer, T. (1980) *Libanius. Briefe. Griechisch-deutsch*, ed. and trans. by G. Fatouros and T. Krischer, Munich, Heimeran Verlag.
- Feissel, D. (1995) 'Les constitutions des Tétrarques connues par l'épigraphie: Inventaire et notes critiques', *AntTard* 3: 33–53.
- (1998) 'Vicaires et proconsuls d'Asie du IV^{ème} et VI^{ème} siècles. Remarques sur l'administration du diocèse asianique au Bas-Empire', *AntTard* 6: 91–104.
- (1999) 'L'adnotatio de Constantin sur le droit de cité d'Orcistus en Phrygie', *AntTard* 7: 255–67.
- (2007) 'Sources documentaires et histoire administrative de l'Orient romain tardif, IV^e–VII^e siècles', *Livret-Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études IV^e section: Sciences historiques et philologiques* 21 (2005–6): 149–50.

Bibliography

- (2009) 'Les actes de l'Etat impérial dans l'épigraphie tardive (324–610). Prolégomènes à un inventaire' in R. Haensch (ed.) *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation. Die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt*, Vestigia 61, Munich, C. H. Beck: 97–128.
- (2010) *Documents, droits, diplomatique de l'empire romain tardif*, Bilans de recherche 7, Paris, Association des amis du centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance.
- (2014) 'Fabius Titianus, proconsul d'Asie sous Constantin, et les origines du culte de l'apôtre Jean à Éphèse' in M. L. Caldelli and G. L. Gregori (eds) *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio 30 anni dopo*, Tituli 10, Rome, Quasar: 159–66.
- (2016) 'L'épigraphie d'Orient, témoin des mutations de l'empire constantinien' in O. Brandt and C. Gastiglia (eds) *Acta XVI Congressus internationalis archaeologiae Christianae, Romae (22–28.9.2013). Constantino e i Constantinidi l'innovazione Costantiniana, le su radice e I suoi suiluppi*, vol. 2, Studi di Antichità Cristiana 66, Vatican City, Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana: 1221–34.
- Feissel, D., and Philippidis-Braat, A. (1985) 'Inventaires en vue d'un recueil des inscriptions historiques de Byzance. III. Inscriptions du Péloponnèse (à l'exception de Mistra)', *Travaux et Mémoires* 9: 267–395.
- Feissel, D., and Wörrle, M. (2015) 'Eine Ehrung des Älteren Theodosius, und ein spätantikes Edikt zur Steuererhebung in Limyra', *Chiron* 45: 267–90.
- Fernoux, H.-L. (2004) *Notables des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine (IIIe siècle av. J.-C- IIIe siècle apr. J.-C)*, Lyon, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.
- Ferri, G. (2015) 'The last dance of the Salians. The pagan élite of Rome and Christian emperors in the fourth century', *Millennium* 12: 117–53.
- Flaig, E. (1992) *Den Kaiser herausfordern. Die Usurpation im Römischen Reich*, Frankfurt, Campus Verlag.
- (1997) 'Für eine Konzeptionalisierung der Usurpationen im spätrömischen Reich' in F. Paschoudoss and J. Szidat (eds) *Usurpationen in der Spätantike. Akten des Kolloquium 'Staatsstreich und Staatlichkeit'*, 6.–10. März 1996, Solothurn-Bern, Historia Einzelschriften 11, Frankfurt, Campus Verlag: 15–34.
- Flower, R. (2012) 'Visions of Constantine', *JRS* 181: 1–19 [review article of Girardet (2010), Veyne (2010), Barnes (2011), Van Dam (2011), Harries (2012)].
- (2013) *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2016) *Imperial Invectives Against Constantius II: Athanasius of Alexandria's History of the Arians, Hilary of Poitiers' Against Constantius and Lucifer of Cagliari's The Necessity of Dying for the Son of God*, TTH 67, Liverpool, Liverpool, University Press.

Bibliography

- Foss, C. (1990) 'Late antique and Byzantine Ankara' in C. Foss (ed.) *History and Archaeology of Byzantine Asia Minor*, Collected Studies Series, Aldershot, Routledge: 29–87. Reprinted article first published in 1977 in *DOP* 31.
- Fowden, G. (1987) 'Nicagoras of Athens and the Lateran obelisk', *JRA* 107: 51–7.
- (1994) 'The last days of Constantine. Oppositional versions and their influence', *JRS* 84: 146–70.
- Frakes, R. M. (2001) '*Contra Potentium Iniurias*'. *The 'Defensor Civitatis' and Late Roman Justice*, Münchner Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 90, Munich, C. H. Beck.
- (2012) 'The dynasty of Constantine down to 363' in N. Lenski (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, 2nd edn, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 91–107.
- Frantz, A. (1988) *Late Antiquity A.D. 267–700*, with contributions by H. A. Thompson and J. Travlos, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athenian Agora 24, Athens/Princeton, American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Fraschetti, A. (1986) 'Costantino e l'abbandono del Campidoglio' in A. Giardina (ed.) *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, 2, Roma: politica, economia, paesaggio urbano, Bari, Laterza: 59–98, 412–38.
- (1999) *La Conversione. Da Roma pagana a Roma cristiana*, Rome/Bari, Laterza.
- Frend, W. H. C. (1989) 'The church in the reign of Constantius II (337–361). Mission – Monasticism – Worship' in A. Dihle (ed.) *L'Église et l'Empire au IV^e siècle*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt 34, Vandoeuvres/Geneva, Fondation Hardt: 73–111.
- Fried, J. (2007) *Donation of Constantine and Constitutum Constantini: The Misinterpretation of a Fiction and its Original Meaning*, Millennium Einzelhefte 3, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Fuhrmann, H. (1939) 'Studien zu den Consulardiptychen verwandter Denkmälern I. Eine Glasschale von der Vicennalienfeier Constantins des Großen zu Rom in Jahre 326 nach Chr.', *RM* 54: 161–75.
- Galsterer, H. (1997) 'Neues zu den römischen Stadtgesetzen', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Romanistische Abteilung* 114.1: 392–401.
- Garbarino, P. (1988) *Ricerche sulla procedura di ammissione al Senato nel tardo impero romano*, Memorie dell'Istituto giuridico (Università di Torino), 3/16, Milan, de Gruyter.
- Gärtner, H. A. (1994) 'Kaiser Constantius II. besucht Rom', *Ktéma* 19: 293–8.
- Gascou, J. (1967) 'Le rescrit d'Hispellum', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 79.2: 609–59.
- Gaudemet, J. (1983) 'Les constitutions constantiniennes du Code Théodosien' in *Atti del V Convegno dell'Accademia Romanistica Constantiniana*, Naples, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane: 135–56.

Bibliography

- Geiger, J. (1999) 'Some Latin authors from the Greek East', *Classical Quarterly* 49: 606–17.
- Giglio, S. (2007) 'Il "munus" della pretura a Roma e Constantinopoli nel tardo imperio romano', *AntTard* 15: 65–88.
- Girardet, K. M. (1975) *Kaisergericht und Bischofsgericht: Studien zu den Anfängen des Donatistenstreites (313–315) und zum Prozeß des Athanasius von Alexandrien (328–346)*, Bonn, Habelt.
- (1977) 'Kaiser Konstantius II. als "Episcopus episcoporum" und das Herrscherbild des christlichen Widerstandes', *Historia* 26: 95–128.
- (2010) *Konstantin und sein Gott. Das Christentum im Denken und in der Religionspolitik Konstantins des Großen*, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- (2012) 'Das Verbot von "betrügerischen Machenschaften" beim Kaiserkult in Hispellum (CIL XI 5265/ILS 705)', *ZPE* 182: 297–311.
- Giuliani, L. (2000) 'Des Siegers Ansprache an das Volk. Zur politischen Brisanz der Frieserzählungen am Constantinsbogen' in C. Neumeister et al. (eds) *Rede und Redner*, Frankfurter Archäologische Schriften 1, Frankfurt, Bibliopolis: 267–88.
- Goldbeck, F., and Wienand, J. (eds) (2016) *Der römische Triumph in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, Berlin/Boston, MA, De Gruyter.
- González, J., and Crawford, M. (1986) 'The *lex Irnitana*. A new copy of the Flavian municipal law', *JRS* 79: 147–243.
- Grig, L. (2009) 'Imagining the capitolium in late antiquity' in A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds) *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity: Selected Papers from the Seventh Biennial Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity Conference, University of Colorado at Boulder, 22–25 March 2007*, Farnham, Ashgate: 279–92.
- (2012) 'Competing capitals, competing representations. Late antique cityscapes in words and pictures' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 31–52.
- Grig, L., and Kelly, G. (eds) (2012) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Groag, E. (1946) *Die Reichsbeamten in Achaia in spätrömischer Zeit*, Dissertationes Pannonicae Musei Nationalis Hungarici 1/14, Budapest, Institute of Numismatics and Archaeology of the P. Pázmány University.
- Grünewald, T. (1990) *Constantinus Maximus Augustus*, Historia Einzelschriften 64, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- Guilland, R. (1976) 'Egreme – perfectissime – clarissime' in R. Guilland, *Titres et fonctions de l'Empire byzantin*, London (reprinted from Epêtêris Etaireias Buzantinón Soudón 35).
- Gutsfeld, A. (1998) 'Der Prätorianerpräfekt und der kaiserliche Hof im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.' in A. Winterling (ed.) *Comitatus. Beiträge zur Erforschung des spätantiken Kaiserhofes*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag: 75–202.
- Haehling, R. von (1978) *Die Religionszugehörigkeit der hohen Amtsträger des Römischen Reiches seit Constantins I. Alleinherrschaft bis zum Ende der*

Bibliography

- Theodosianischen Dynastie (324–450 bzw. 455 n. Chr.)*, *Antiquitas* 3/23, Bonn, Habelt.
- Halfmann, H. (1979) *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.*, *Hypomnemata* 58, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1982) 'Die Senatoren aus den kleinasiatischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert (Asia, Pontus-Bithynia, Lycia-Pamphylia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia)' in S. Panciera (ed.) *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio*, Pisa, Quasar: 603–50.
- (2007) 'Italische Ursprünge bei Rittern und Senatoren aus Kleinasien' in G. Urso (ed.) *Tra Oriente Occidente: Indigeni, Greci et Romani in Asia Minore*, Fondazione Niccolò Camussio, Pisa, Edizioni ETS: 165–87.
- (2008) 'Die Catilii aus Apamea in Bithynien' in H. Börm, N. Erhardt and J. Wiesehöfer (eds) *Monumentum et instrumentum inscriptum. Beschriftete Objekte aus Kaiserzeit und Spätantike als historische Zeugnisse. Festschrift für Peter Weiss zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- Harper, K. (2008) 'A Greek census inscription from late-antiquity', *JRS* 98: 83–119.
- (2011) *Slavery in the Roman World, AD 275–425*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Harries, J. (1988) 'The Roman imperial *quaestor* from Constantine to Theodosius II', *JRS* 78: 148–72.
- (1999) *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2003) 'Favor populi. Pagans, Christians and public entertainments in the late antique city' in T. Lomas and T. Cornell (eds) *Bread and Circuses*, London, Routledge: 125–41.
- (2010) 'Constantine the law-giver' in C. Sogno, S. McGill and E. Watts (eds) *From the Tetrarchy to the Theodosians. Later Roman History and Culture, 284–450 CE*, *Yale Classical Studies* 34, Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press: 73–92.
- (2012) *Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363: The New Empire*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- (2014) 'The empresses' tale, AD 300–360' in C. Harrison, C. Humfress and I. Sandwell (eds) *Being Christian in Late Antiquity. A Festschrift for Gillian Clark*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 197–214.
- Heather, P. J. (1994) 'New men for new Constantines? Creating an imperial elite in the eastern Mediterranean' in P. Magdalino (ed.) *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries*, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications 2, Aldershot, Variorum: 11–33.
- (1998) 'Senators and senates' in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, *The Late Empire, A.D. 337–425*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 184–210.

Bibliography

- (2010) 'Liar in winter: Themistius and Theodosius' in S. McGill, C. Sogno and E. Watts (eds) *From the Tetrarchs to the Theodosians. Later Roman History and Culture, 284–450 AD*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 185–214.
- Heather and Moncur (2001) = P. J. Heather and D. Moncur (2001) *Politics, Philosophy, and Empire in the Fourth Century: Select Orations of Themistius*, TTH 36, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Heberdey, R., Niemann, G., and Wilberg, W. (1912) *Das Theater in Ephesos, Forschungen in Ephesos*, 2, Vienna, Selbstverlag des ÖAI Wien.
- Henck, N. (1998) 'Images of Constantius II: ὁ Φιλάνθρωπος Βασιλεὺς and Imperial Propaganda in the Mid-Fourth Century A.D.', DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.
- (2001) 'Constantius' *paideia*, intellectual milieu and promotion of the liberal arts', *PCPhS* 47: 172–86.
- (2002) 'Constantius ὁ Φιλοκτίστης?', *DOP* 55: 279–304.
- (2007) 'Constantius II and the cities' in J. F. Drinkwater and R. W. B. Salway (eds) *Wolf Liebeschuetz Reflected. Essays Presented by Colleagues, Friends, and Pupils*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, suppl. 91, London, University of London Institute of Classical Studies: 147–56.
- Hendrick, C. W. (2000) *History and Silence. The Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*, Austin, TX, University of Texas Press.
- Hendy, M. F. (1989) *The Economy, Fiscal Administration and Coinage of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Variorum.
- Hermann-Otto, E. (2001) 'Promotionszeremoniell und Personalpolitik an kaiserlichen Residenzen' in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana. XIII Convegno internazionale in memoria di André Chastagnol*, Naples, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane: 83–105.
- (2007) *Konstantin der Große*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Hillner, J. (2017) 'A woman's place. Imperial women in late antique Rome (c. 312–410)', *AntTard* 25: 75–94.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1913) 'Die Rangtitel der römischen Kaiserzeit' in O. Hirschfeld (ed.) *Kleine Schriften*. Berlin, Weidmann: 646–81. Reprinted from *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 25 (1901): 579–610.
- Holloway, R. R. (2004) *Constantine and Rome*, New Haven, CT/London, Yale University Press.
- Holum, K. G. (1990) 'Hadrian and St. Helena. Imperial travel and the origins of Christian Holy Land pilgrimage' in R. Ousterhout (ed.) *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, Urbana/Chicago, IL, University of Illinois Press: 66–81.
- Horstkotte, H. (2000) 'Die Principales des spätrömischen Dekurionenrates', *ZPE* 130: 272–8.

Bibliography

- (2001) 'Die überkommunalen Ränge im Dekurionenrat der spätrömischen Kaiserzeit', *Klio* 83.1: 152–60.
- Humphrey, J. H. (1986) *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Humphries, M. (1997) 'In nomine patris: Constantine the Great and Constantius II in christological polemic', *Historia* 46: 448–64.
- (2003) 'Roman senators and absent emperors in late antiquity', *AAAH* 17 (NS 3): 27–46.
- (2007) 'From emperor to pope? Ceremonial, space, and authority at Rome from Constantine to Gregory the Great' in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds) *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300–900*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 21–59.
- (2012) 'Reading between the lines. Julian's first panegyric on Constantius' in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds) *Emperor and Author. The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales: 75–90.
- (2015) 'Emperors, usurpers, and the City of Rome. Performing power from Diocletian to Theodosius' in J. Wienand (ed.) *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 151–68.
- Hunt, D. (1998) 'The successors of Constantine' in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, *The Late Empire, A.D. 337–425*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1–43.
- (1999) 'The outsider inside. Ammianus and the rebellion of Silvanus' in J. W. Drijvers and D. Hunt (eds) *The Late Roman World and its Historian. Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London, Routledge: 51–63.
- (2003) 'Imperial building at Rome. The role of Constantine' in K. Lomas and T. Cornell (eds) *Bread and Circuses*, London, Routledge: 105–24.
- Iara, K. (2015) 'Senatorial aristocracy. How individual is individual religiosity' in E. Rebillard and J. Rüpke (eds) *Group Identity and Religious Individualism in Late Antiquity*, CUA studies in Early Christianity, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press: 165–214.
- Irmscher, J. (1983) "'Neurom" oder "zweites Rom". Renovatio oder Translatio', *Klio* 65: 431–9.
- Isaac, B. (1998) 'The eastern frontier' in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, *The Late Empire, A.D. 337–425*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 437–60.
- (2009) 'Latin in the cities of the Roman Near East' in H. M. Cotton et al. (eds) *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 43–72.
- Isele, B. (2010) *Kampf um Kirchen. Religiöse Gewalt, heiliger Raum und christliche Topographie in Alexandria und Konstantinopel (4. Jh.)*, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband Kleine Reihe 4, Münster, Aschendorff Verlag.

Bibliography

- Jacques, F. (1985) "'Obnoxius curiae". Origines et formes de l'astreinte à la cité au IV^e siècle de notre ère', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger?*: 303–28.
- (1986) 'L'ordine senatorio attraverso la crisi del III secolo' in A. Giardina (ed.) *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, 1, Rome, Laterza: 81–226.
- Janin, R. (1964) *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Archives de l'Orient Chrétien, 2nd edn, Paris, Archives De L'Orient Chrétien.
- Jones, A. H. M. (1954) 'The date and value of the Verona List', *JRS* 44: 21–9.
- (1955) 'The career of Flavius Philippus', *Historia* 6: 229–33.
- (1963) 'The social background of the struggle between paganism and Christianity' in A. Momigliano (ed.) *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford, Clarendon Press: 17–37.
- (1964) *The Later Roman Empire 284–602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, 3 vols, Baltimore, MD, Oxford Blackwell.
- Kaegi, W. E. (1967) 'Domestic military problems of Julian the Apostate', *Byzantinische Forschungen* 2: 247–64.
- Kantiréa, M. (2013) 'Gouverneurs, évêques et notables de Chypre au Bas-Empire' in S. Benoist (ed.) *La vie des autres: Histoire, prosopographie, biographie dans l'Empire romain*. Villeneuve d'Ascq, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion: 113–27.
- Kaster, R. A. (1983) 'The salaries of Libanius', *Chiron* 13: 37–59.
- (1988) *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Kelly, C. M. (1998) 'Emperors, government and bureaucracy' in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, *The Late Empire, A.D. 337–425*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 138–83.
- (2012) 'Bureaucracy and government' in N. Lenski (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, 2nd edn, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 183–204.
- Kelly, G. (2003) 'The new Rome and the old. Ammianus Marcellinus' silence on Constantinople', *CQ* 53.2: 588–607.
- (2008) *Ammianus Marcellinus. The Allusive Historian*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2014) *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge, MA, and London, Harvard University Press.
- Kent, J. P. C. (1978) 'Urbs Roma and Constantinopolis medallions at the mint of Rome' in R. A. G. Carson and C. M. Kraay (eds) *Scripta Nummaria Romana. Essays Presented to Humphrey Sutherland*, London, Spink & Son Ltd: 105–13, pls 12–13.
- (1981) *The Roman Imperial Coinage VIII. The Family of Constantine I, A.D. 337–364*, London, Spink & Son Ltd.
- Kienast, D. (1966) *Untersuchungen zu den Kriegsflotten der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Bonn, Habelt Verlag.

Bibliography

- Klein, R. (1977) *Constantius II. und die christliche Kirche*, Impulse der Forschung 26, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- (1979) 'Der Rombesuch des Kaisers Konstantius II im Jahre 357', *Athenaeum* NS 57: 98–115.
- Kleinbauer, W. E. (1988) 'The Anastasis rotunda and Christian architectural invention', *Journal of the Centre for Jewish Art* 23/24: 140–6.
- Koep, L. (1958) 'Die Konsekrationsmünzen Kaiser Konstantins und ihre religionspolitische Bedeutung', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 1: 94–104.
- Kolb, A. (1998) 'Kaiser Julians Innenpolitik. Grundlegende Reformen oder traditionelle Verwaltung?', *Historia* 47.3: 342–59.
- König, I. (1987) *Origo Constantini. Anonymus Valesianus*, 1, *Text und Kommentar*, Trier, von Zabern Verlag.
- Kraft, K. (1950–1) 'Eine spätantike Glasplatte', *JNG* 2: 36–42.
- (1958) 'Die Taten der Kaiser Constans und Constantius II', *JNG* 9: 141–86.
- Krallis, D. (2014) 'Greek Glory, Constantinian Legend: Praxagoras' Athenian Agenda in Zosimos' New History', *JLA* 7.1: 110–30.
- Krause, J.-U. (1987) *Spätantike Patronatsformen im Westen des Römischen Reiches*, Vestigia 38, Munich, C. H. Beck.
- Krautheimer, R., with W. Frankl, S. Corbett and A. K. Frazer (1937–80) *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae. The Early Christian Basilicas of Rome (IV–IX cent.)*, 5 vols, Vatican City, Pontificio istituto di archeologia Cristiana.
- (1983) *Three Christian Capitals. Topography and Politics*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- (1987) 'A note on the inscriptions of the apse of Old St. Peter's', *DOP* 41: 317–20.
- Krüger, P. (1877a) *Codex Iustinianus*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- (1877b) *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 1, *Institutiones*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- Kuban, Z. (2006) 'Konstantins neue Polis: Konstantinopel' in A. Demandt (ed.) *Konstantin der Große: Geschichte – Archäologie – Rezeption. Internationales Kolloquium vom 10. – 15. Oktober an der Universität Trier zur Landesausstellung Rheinland-Pfalz 2007 'Konstantin der Große'*, Trier, von Zabern: 221–34.
- Kuhoff, W. (1982) 'Die Bedeutung der Ämter in Clarissimat und Spektabilität für die zivile senatorische Laufbahn im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.', *Tituli* 4: 271–98.
- (1983) *Studien zur zivilen senatorischen Laufbahn im 4. Jhd. nach Chr.*, Frankfurt/Bern, Peter Lang Verlagsgruppe.
- (1991) 'Ein Mythos in der römischen Geschichte. Der Sieg Konstantins des Großen über Maxentius vor den Toren Roms am 28. Oktober 312 n. Chr.', *Chiron* 21: 127–74.
- Laconi, S. (2004) *Costanzo II. Ritratto di un imperatore eretico*, Introduction by Lambert Ferreres, Rome, Herder.

Bibliography

- Lançon, B. (2000) *Rome in Late Antiquity*, English edn, Edinburgh, Routledge.
- Lane Fox, R. (1997) 'The Itinerary of Alexander. Constantius to Julian', *CQ* 47.1: 239–52.
- Laniado, A. (2002) *Recherches sur les notable municipales dans l'empire protobyzantin*, Travaux et Mémoires 13, Paris, Monographies Du Centre De Recherches d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance.
- Laurence, R. (2004) 'Milestones, communications, and political stability' in L. Ellis and F. L. Kidner (eds) *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity. Sacred and Profane. Biennial Conference on Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity on 4 July 2001 at the State University of San Francisco*, Aldershot, Routledge: 41–58.
- Lavan, L. (2007) 'The Agora of Antioch and Constantinople as seen by John Chrysostom' in J. F. Drinkwater and R. W. B. Salway (eds) *Wolf Liebeschuetz Reflected. Essays Presented by Colleagues, Friends, and Pupils*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, suppl. 91, London, University of London Institute of Classical Studies: 157–67.
- Leadbetter, B. (2009) *Galerius and the Will of Diocletian*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Leader-Newby, R. E. (2004) *Silver and Society in Late Antiquity. Functions and Meanings of Silver Plate in the Fourth to the Seventh Centuries*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Lee, A. D. (1998) 'The army' in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, *The Late Empire, A.D. 337–425*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 211–37.
- Lemerle, P. (1945) *Philippe et la Macédoine orientale à l'époque chrétienne et byzantine*, Paris, Éditions de Boccard.
- (1971) *Le premier humanisme byzantin: Notes et remarques sur enseignements et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- London, J. F. (1997) *Empire of Honour. The Art of Government in the Roman World*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Lenski, N. (ed.) (2002) *Failure of Empire. Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century AD*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- (2004) 'Empresses in the Holy Land. The creation of a Christian utopia in late antique Palestine' in L. Ellis and F. L. Kidner (eds) *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity*, Aldershot, Ashgate: 113–24.
- (2008) 'Evoking the pagan past. *Instinctu Divinitatis* and Constantine's capture of Rome', *JLA* 1.2: 204–57.
- (2012a) *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, 2nd edn, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2012b) 'The reign of Constantine' in N. Lenski (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, 2nd edn, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 59–90.

Bibliography

- (2014) 'The sun and the senate. The inspiration for the Arch of Constantine' in E. Dal Cavolo and G. Sfameni Gasparro (eds) *Costantino il Grande. Alle radici dell'Europa. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio in occasione del 1700° anniversario della Battaglia di Ponte Milvio e della conversion di Costantino*, Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana: 155–96.
- (2015) 'Constantine and the Tyche of Constantinople' in J. Wienand (ed.) *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 330–52.
- (2016) *Constantine and the Cities. Imperial Authority and Civic Politics*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lenssen, J. (1999) 'The Persian invasion of 359. Presentation by suppression in Ammianus Marcellinus *Res Gestae* 18.4.1–18.6.7' in J. W. Drijvers and D. Hunt (eds) *The Late Roman World and its Historian. Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London, Routledge: 40–50.
- Lepelley, C. (1979) *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire I. La permanence d'une civilisation municipale*, Paris, Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes.
- (1992) 'Permanences de la cité classique et archaïsmes municipaux en Italie au Bas Empire' in M. Christol (ed.) *Institutions, société et vie publique dans l'empire romain au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C., Actes de la table ronde autour de l'œuvre d'André Chastagnol (Paris, 20–21 janvier 1989)*, Rome, École Française de Rome: 353–71.
- (1999) 'Du triomphe à la disparition. Le destin de l'ordre équestre de Dioclétien à Théodose' in S. Demougin, H. Devijver and M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier (eds) *L'ordre équestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (II^e siècle av. J.-C.–III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Actes de colloque international organisé par S. Demougin, H. Devijver et M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier. Bruxelles-Leuven, 5–7 octobre 1995, Collection de l'école française de Rome 257, Rome, École Française de Rome: 629–46.
- Leppin, H. (1996) *Von Constantin dem Großen zu Theodosius II. Das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1999) 'Constantius II. und das Heidentum', *Athenaeum* 87: 457–80.
- (2007) 'Old religions transformed. Religions and religious policy from Decius to Constantine' in J. Rüpke (ed.) *The Blackwell Companion to Roman Religion*, London, Wiley Blackwell: 96–108.
- Leppin, H., and Portmann, W. (1998) *Themistios. Staatsreden*, Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 46, Stuttgart, Hiersemann.
- Lewin, A. (2001) 'Urban public building from Constantine to Julian. The epigraphic evidence' in L. Lavan (ed.) *Recent Research in Late-Antique Urbanism*, Portsmouth, Journal of Roman Archaeology, suppl. ser. 42: 27–38.
- Liesbeschuetz, J. H. W. G. (1959) 'The Syriarch in the fourth century', *Historia* 8: 113–26.

Bibliography

- (1972) *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- (2001) *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- (2003) 'Pagan historiography and the decline of the empire' in G. Marasco (ed.) *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century*, Leiden, Brill: 172–218.
- Lieu, S. N. C., and Montserrat, D. (1998) *Constantine: History, Hagiography and Legend*, New York, Routledge.
- Lightfoot C. S. (2005) 'Armenia and the eastern marches' in A. K. Bowman, P. Garnsey and A. Cameron (eds) *Cambridge Ancient History*, 12, *The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193–337*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 481–97.
- Limberis, V. M. (2005) 'Ecclesiastical ambiguities. Corinth in the fourth and fifth centuries' in D. Schowalter and S. Friesen (eds) *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, Harvard Theological Studies 53, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press: 443–57.
- Lizzi Testa, R. (1986) 'Un epigramma del tardo imperiale da Hierapolis', *Annali della Scuola Superiore di Pisa* 16: 691–716.
- (2004) *Senatori, popolo, papi. Il governo di Roma al tempo dei Valentiniani*, Bari, Edipuglia.
- (ed.) (2006) *Le trasformazioni delle élites in età tardoantica. Atti del Convegno Internazionale. Perugia, 15–16 marzo 2004*, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- (2009) 'Alle origini della tradizione pagana su Costantino e il senato romano (Amm. Marc. 21.10.8 e Zos. 2.32.1)' in P. Rousseau and M. Papoutsakis (eds) *The Transformation of Late Antiquity. Essays for Peter Brown*, Farnham, Ashgate: 85–128.
- (2013) 'Constantino et il senato Romano' in *Constantino I. Enciclopedia Costantiniana sulla figura e l'immagine dell' imperatore del cosiddetto editto di Milano 313–2013*, 1, Rome, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana: 351–67.
- (2015) 'The Famous Altar of Victory Controversy in Rome. The Impact of Christianity at the End of the Fourth Century' in J. Weinand (ed.) *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 405–22.
- Lizzi Testa, R., Sághy, M., and Salzman, M. R. (eds) (2016) *Pagans and Christians in Late Antique Rome. Conflict, Competition and Coexistence in the Fourth Century*, Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Lo Cascio, E. (2005) 'The new state of Diocletian and Constantine. From the Tetrarchy to the reunification of the empire' in A. K. Bowman, P. Garnsey and A. Cameron (eds) *Cambridge Ancient History*, 12, *The Crisis of Empire, A.D. 193–337*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 170–83.

Bibliography

- Löhken, H. (1982) *Ordines Dignitatum. Untersuchungen zur formalen Konstituierung der spätantiken Führungsschicht*, Cologne/Vienna, Bohlau.
- MacCormack, S. (1975) 'Latin prose panegyrics' in T. A. Dorey (ed.) *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Books: 143–205.
- (1981) *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 1, Berkeley/Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- McCormick, M. (1986) *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McEvoy, M. (2013) *Child Emperor Rule in the Late Roman West, AD 367–455*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- McEvoy, M., and Moser, M. (2017) 'Imperial presence in late antique Rome, third century BC to sixth century AD', *AntTard* 25: 15–21.
- Machado, C. (2010) 'The city as stage. Aristocratic commemorations in late-antique Rome' in E. Rebillard and C. Sotinel (eds) *Les frontières du profane dans l'Antiquité tardive*, Rome, École Française de Rome: 287–317.
- (2012) 'Aristocratic houses and the making of late antique Rome and Constantinople' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 136–58.
- McLynn, N. (2004) 'The transformation of imperial churchgoing in the fourth century' in S. Swain and M. Edwards (eds) *Approaching Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 235–70.
- (2006) 'Curiales into churchmen. The case of Gregory Nazianzen' in R. Lizzi Testa (ed.) *Le trasformazioni delle élites in età tardoantica, Atti del Convegno Internazionale. Perugia, 15–16 marzo 2004*, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider: 277–95.
- (2012) 'Two Romes, beacons of the whole world. Canonizing Constantinople' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 345–63.
- MacMullen, R. (1964) 'Some pictures in Ammianus Marcellinus', *Art Bulletin* 46.4: 435–55.
- Malcus, B. (1967) 'Die Prokonsuln von Asien von Diocletian bis Theodosius II', *Opuscula Athenensia* 7: 91–160.
- Malosse, P.-L. (2001a) 'Antioche et le Kappa' in B. Cabouret, P.-L. Gatier and C. Saliou (eds) *Antioche de Syrie. Histoire, images et traces de la ville antique. Colloque organisé par B. Cabouret, P.-L. Gatier et C. Saliou. Lyon, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 4,5,6 octobre 2001. Topoi supplement 5*, Lyon, Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen: 77–96.
- (2001b) 'Enquête sur la date du discours 59 de Libanios', *AntTard* 9: 297–306.

Bibliography

- (2003) *Libanios. Discours. Tome IV: Discours LIX*, ed. and trans. P.-L. Malosse, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Mango, C. (1959) *The Brazen House: A Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople*, Copenhagen, Arkaelogisk-kunsthistoriske Meddelelser.
- (1985) *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e–VII^e Siècles)*, Paris, Éditions de Boccard.
- (1990a) 'Constantine's mausoleum and the translation of relics', *ByzZ* 83: 51–62.
- (1990b) 'Constantine's mausoleum. An addendum', *ByzZ* 83: 434.
- (2001) 'The shoreline of Constantinople in the fourth century' in N. Necipoğlu (ed.) *Byzantine Constantinople. Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life. Papers from the International Workshop held at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 7–10 April 1999*. Leiden, Brill: 17–28.
- Maraval, P. (2013) *Les fils de Constantin*, Paris, Éditions du CNRS.
- Marcone, A. (1993) 'Constantino e l'aristocrazia pagana di Roma' in G. Bonamente and F. Fusco (eds) *Costantino il Grande. Dall'antichità all'umanesimo, Colloquio sul Cristianesimo nel Mondo Antico, Macerata 18–20 dicembre 1990*, 2, Macerata, EGLE: 648–58.
- (2008) *Di tarda antichità. Scritti scelti*, Milan, Le Monnier università.
- Martin, J., and Petit, P. (1979) *Libanius, Discours, 1, Autobiographie (Discours 1)*, ed. Jean Martin and trans. Paul Petit, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Martindale, J. R. (1980) 'Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Addenda et corrigenda to volume I', *Historia* 29: 474–97.
- Matthews, J. F. (1971) 'Gallic supporters of Theodosius', *Latomus* 30: 1073–99 = J. F. Matthews (1985) *Political Life and Culture in Late Roman Society*, London, Variorum Publications: 58–99.
- (1975/1990) *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, AD 364–425*, S2nd edn with postscript, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- (1986) 'Ammianus and the eastern frontier. A participant's view' in P. Freeman and D. Kennedy (eds) *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986*, 1. British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph 8, BAR International Series 297, Oxford, BAR: 549–64.
- (1989) *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, Oxford, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- (1992) 'The poetess Proba and fourth-century Rome. Questions of interpretation' in M. Christol et al. (eds) *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IV^e siècle après J.-C.*, Rome, École Française de Rome: 277–304.
- (2000a) *Laying down the Law. A Study of the Theodosian Code*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.
- (2000b) 'The Roman empire and the proliferation of elites', *Arethusa* 33.3: 429–46.

Bibliography

- (2012) 'The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 81–115.
- Maurice, J. (1911) *Numismatique Constantinienne*, 3 vols, Paris, Leroux.
- Mayer, E. (2002) *Rom ist dort, wo der Kaiser ist. Untersuchung zu den Staatsdenkmälern des dezentralisierten Reiches von Diocletian bis zu Theodosius II.*, Bonn, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum.
- Mazzarino, S. (1951) 'La propaganda senatoriale nel tardo imperio', *Doxa* 4: 121–48.
- Meier, M. (2009) *Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des byzantinischen Reiches*, Stuttgart, Klett Cotta.
- Mennen, I. (2011) *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193–284*, Impact of Empire 12, Leiden, Brill.
- Métivier, S. (2005) *La Cappadoce (IV^e–VI^e siècle). Une histoire provinciale de l'Empire Romain d'Orient*, Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Migl, J. (1994) *Die Ordnung der Ämter. Prätorianerpräfektur und Vikariat in der Regionalverwaltung des römischen Reiches von Konstantin bis zur Valentinianischen Dynastie*. Europäische Hochschulschriften 3/623, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang Verlagsgruppe.
- Millar, F. (1969) 'Herennius Dexippus. The Greek world and the third-century invasions', *JRS* 59: 12–29.
- (1992) *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC–AD 337)*, London, Duckworth.
- (2006) *A Greek Roman Empire. Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408/50)*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- (2009) 'Linguistic co-existence in Constantinople. Greek and Latin (and Syriac) in the Acts of the Synod of 536 C.E.', *JRS* 99: 92–103.
- Millner, N. (2015) 'A new statue-base for Constantius II and the fourth-century imperial cult at Oinoanda', *Anatolian Studies* 65: 181–203.
- Miltner, F. (1959) 'XXII. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesos', *JÖAI* 44: 243–314.
- Mitchell, S. (1993a) *Anatolia. Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, 1, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- (1993b) *Anatolia. The Rise of the Church*, 2, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Mitchell, S., and French, D. (2012) *The Inscriptions of Roman Ankara*, 1, Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik, Vestigia 62, Munich, C. H. Beck.
- Mittag, F. P. (1999) *Alte Köpfe in neuen Händen: Urheber und Funktion der Kontorniaten*, Bonn, Habelt Verlag.
- Mócsy, A. (1974) *Pannonia and Upper Moesia. A History of the Middle Danube Provinces of the Roman Empire*, London, Routledge.
- Moreau, J. (1955) 'Zum Problem der Vita Constantini', *Historia* 4: 234–45.
- Moro, M. (1996) 'I prefetti del pretorio degli anni 355–363. Indagine prosopografica, funzioni, rapporti con gli imperatori' in G. Crifò and

Bibliography

- S. Gilio (eds) *Atti dell' Accademia Romanistica Constantiniana 11. XI Convegno Internazionale in Onore di Felix B. J. Wubbe*, Naples, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane: 369–76.
- Moser, M. (2014) 'Eine spätantike lateinische Inschrift aus Laodikeia-ad-Mare als Dokument der zentralen Rolle von Häfen in der römischen Militärlogistik' in W. Eck and P. Funke (eds) *Öffentlichkeit – Monument – Text. Akten des XIV Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae 27.-31- August MMXII*, Berlin, De Gruyter: 445–8.
- (2016a) 'Le concept de dynastie d'après les inscriptions de Constantin et des Constantinides' in O. Brandt and C. Gastiglia (eds) *Acta XVI Congressus internationalis archaeologiae Christianae, Romae (22–28.9.2013). Constantino e i Constantinidi l'innovazione Constantiniana, le sue radici e i suoi sviluppi*, 2, Studi di Antichità Cristiana 66, Vatican City, Pontificio Istituto di archeologia Cristiana: 1235–43.
- (2016b) 'Property and power in the Senate of Constantinople', *JLA* 9.2: 436–61.
- (2017) 'Ein Kaiser geht auf Distanz. Die Rompolitik Constans I.', *AntTard* 25: 41–58.
- Mosig-Walburg, K. (2000) 'Die Flucht des persischen Prinzen Hormizd und sein Exil im Römischen Reich: Eine Untersuchung der Quellen', *Iranica Antica* 35: 69–109.
- Mudd, M. M. (1984) *Aspects of Internal Government of the Later Roman Empire in the Reign of Constantius II, A.D. 337–361*, PhD dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ. Publ. Ann Arbor, MI, University Microfilms International.
- Näf, B. (1995) *Senatorisches Standesbewußtsein in spätrömischer Zeit. Paradosis*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur und Theologie 40, Fribourg, Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz.
- Neesen, L. (1981) 'Die Entwicklung der Leistungen und Ämter (*munera et honores*) im römischen Kaiserreich des zweiten bis vierten Jahrhunderts', *Hermes* 30: 203–33.
- Néri, V. (1974) 'Le prefeture del pretorio in occidente nel periodo 346–350 d. C.', *Rivista storia dell' antichità* 4: 89–117.
- Niquet, H. (2000) *Monumenta virtutum titulique. Senatorische Selbstdarstellung im spätantiken Rom im Spiegel der epigraphischen Denkmäler*, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- Nixon, C. E. V., and Rodgers, B. S. (1994) *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Noethlichs, K. L. (1971) *Die gesetzgeberischen Maßnahmen der christlichen Kaiser des vierten Jahrhunderts gegen Häretiker, Heiden und Juden*, Cologne, Wasmund-Bothmann.
- (1989) 'Kirche, Recht und Gesellschaft in der Jahrhundertmitte' in A. Dihle (ed.) *L'Église et l'Empire au IV^e siècle*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt 34, Vandoeuvres/Geneva, Fondation Hardt: 147–99.

Bibliography

- (1991) 'Hofbeamter', *RAC* 15: 1111–58.
- Nollé, J. (1993) *Side im Altertum: Geschichte und Zeugnisse*, 1, Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 43, Bonn, Habelt Verlag.
- (2001) *Side im Altertum: Geschichte und Zeugnisse*, 2, Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 44, Bonn, Habelt Verlag.
- Noreña, C. F. (2011) *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West. Representation, Circulation, Power*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Norman A. F. (1954) 'The family of Argyrius', *JHS* 74: 44–8.
- (1969) *Libanius, Selected Works*, 1, *The Julianic Orations*, Loeb Classical Library 451, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- (1992a) *Libanius, Autobiography and Selected Letters*, 1, Loeb Classical Library 478, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- (1992b) *Libanius, Autobiography and Selected Letters*, 2, Loeb Classical Library 478, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- (2000) *Antioch as a Centre of Hellenic Culture as Observed by Libanius*, trans. with an Introduction, TTH 34, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
- Novak, R. M. (1979) 'Constantine and the senates. An early phase in the Christianisation of the Roman aristocracy', *AncSoc* 10: 271–310.
- Ntantalia, F. (2001) *Bronzemedallions unter Konstantin dem Großen und seinen Söhnen. Die Bildtypen der Constantinopolis und die kaiserliche Medaillonprägung von 330–363 n. Chr.*, Saarbrücken, Saarbrücker Druckerei & Verlag.
- Olbrich, K. (2004) 'Athanasius, die Kaiser und der Ausbruch einer neuen Ära: Propaganda und Münzprägung um 343 n. Chr.', *Klio* 86: 415–41.
- Olszaniec, S. (2013) *Prosopographical Studies on the Court Elite in the Roman Empire (4th Century AD)*, Torun, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersztetu Mikolaja Kopernika.
- Omissi, A. (2018) *Emperors and Usurpers in the Later Roman Empire. Civil War, Panegyric, and the Construction of Legitimacy*, Oxford Studies of Byzantium, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Oshimizu, Y. (2012) 'La réforme administrative de Dioclétien et les cités africaines', *AntTard* 20: 173–204.
- Ousterhout, R. (2014) 'The life and afterlife of Constantine's column', *JRA* 27: 305–26.
- Pack, E. (1986) *Städte und Steuern in der Politik Julians. Untersuchungen zu den Quellen des Kaiserbildes*, Collection Latomus 196, Brussels, Revue d'Études Latines.
- Palanque, J. R. (1969) 'Du nouveau sur la préfecture d'Illyricum au IV^e Siècle' in J. Bibauw (ed.) *Hommage à Marcel Renard*, Collections Latomus 102, Brussels, Latomus: 600–6.
- Palme, B. (1998) 'Praesides und correctores der Augustamnica', *AntTard* 6: 123–35.
- Penella, R. J. (2000) *The Private Orations of Themistius*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Bibliography

- (2007) *Man and the Word. The Orations of Himerius*, trans., annotated, and introduced by R. J. Penella, Berkeley, CA/London, University of California Press.
- Petit, P. (1950) 'Libanius et la "Vita Constantini"', *Historia* 1: 562–82.
- (1955) *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IV^e siècle apr. J.-C.*, Paris, Institut Française d'Archéologie de Beyrouth.
- (1957) 'Les sénateurs de Constantinople dans l'œuvre de Libanius', *L'Antiquité Classique* 26: 347–82.
- (1981) Review of Vogler, C. (1979) *Constance II et l'administration impériale*, Strasbourg, AECR, *Latomus* 40: 655–7.
- Pfeilschifter, R. (2013) *Der Kaiser und Konstantinopel. Kommunikation und Konfliktaustrag in einer spätantiken Metropole*, Millenium Studien 44, Berlin/Boston, MA, De Gruyter.
- Pflaum, H.-G. (2003) *Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie*, 2, Inscriptions de la confédération cirtéenne, de Cuicul et de la tribu des Suburbures 3, Paris, Latomus.
- Pharr, C. (1952) *The Theodosian Code: and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions. A Translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Pierce, P. (1989) 'The Arch of Constantine: Propaganda and ideology in late Roman art', *Art History* 12.4: 387–418.
- Pietri, L. (1989) 'La politique de Constance II. Un premier "césaropapisme" ou l'*Imitatio Constantini*?' in A. Dihle (ed.) *L'Église et l'Empire au IV^e siècle*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt 34, Vandoeuvres/Geneva, Fondation Hardt: 113–78.
- Pietri, L., and Rondeau, M.-J. (2013) *Vie de Constantin, Eusèbe de Césarée*, critical edn by F. Winkelmann, introd. and notes Luce Pietri, trans. Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, Paris, Ed. du Cerf.
- Piganiol, A. (1972) *L'empire chrétien*, 2nd edn by A. Chastagnol, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Pont, A.-V. (2010) 'Septime Sévère à Byzance. L'invention d'un fondateur', *AntTard* 18: 191–8.
- Porena, P. (2003) *Le origini della prefettura del pretorio tardoantica*, Saggi di storia antica 20, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- (2006) 'Transformazioni istituzionali e assetti sociali: I prefetti del pretoria tra III e IV secolo' in R. Lizzi Testa (ed.) *Le trasformazioni delle élites in età tardoantica. Atti del Convegno Internazionale. Perugia, 15–16 marzo 2004*, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider: 325–56.
- (2014) 'Ancora sulla carriera di Flavius Ablabius, prefetto del pretorio di Costantino', *ZPE* 190: 262–70.
- Portmann, W. (1989) 'Die 59. Rede des Libanius und das Datum der Schlacht von Singara', *ByzZ* 82: 1–18.
- (1999) 'Die politische Krise zwischen den Kaisern Constantius II. und Constans', *Historia* 48: 301–29.

Bibliography

- Portmann (2002) = Portmann, W., Fatouros, G., and Krischer, T. (2002) *Libanios. Kaiserreden*, Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 58, Stuttgart, Hiersemann.
- Potter, D. (2004) *The Roman Empire at Bay: AD 180–396*, London, Routledge.
- (2013) *Constantine the Emperor*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Price, S. R. F. (2008) 'From noble funerals to divine cult. The consecration of Roman emperors' in D. Cannadine and S. R. F. Price (eds) *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 56–105.
- Puech, V. (2015) 'Les biens fonciers des élites sénatoriales à Constantinople et dans les environs (451–641)', *Archimède* 2: 170–92.
- R.-Alföldi, M. (1963) *Die konstantinische Goldprägung*, Mainz, Verlag des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums.
- (1999) *Bild und Bildersprache der römischen Kaiser. Beispiele und Analysen*, Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 81, Mainz, von Zabern Verlag.
- Rebenich, S. (2000) 'Vom dreizehnten Gott zum Apostel? Der tote Kaiser in der christlichen Spätantike', *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 4: 300–24.
- (2007) 'Der Senat' in A. Demandt and J. Engemann (eds) *Konstantin der Große. Imperator Caesar Flavius Constantinus. Ausstellungskatalog*, Mainz, von Zabern Verlag: 179–82.
- (2008) "'Pars melior humani generis" – Aristokratie(n) in der Spätantike' in R. Beck et al. (eds) *Die Macht der Wenigen. Aristokratische Herrschaftspraxis, Kommunikation und 'edler' Lebensstil in der Antike und frühen Neuzeit*, Historische Zeitschrift, Beihefte (NF) 47, Munich, Oldenbourg: 153–75.
- Rees, R. (2002) *Layers of Loyalty in Latin Panegyric, AD 289–307*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- (ed.) (2012) *Latin Panegyric*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Reid, J. S. (1913) *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ritti, T. (2007) 'Inscrizioni pertinenti all'edificio teatrale di Hierapolis' in D. de Bernardi Ferrero, G. Ciotta and P. Pensabene (eds) *Il teatro di Hierapolis di Frigia*, Genoa, de Ferrari: 389–433.
- Rolfe, J. C. (1956) *Ammianus Marcellinus*, trans. by John C. Rolfe, revised and reprinted (1st edns in 1935/1940/1939), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Roman, Y. (2001) *Empereurs et sénateurs. Une histoire politique de l'empire romain*, Paris, Fayard.
- Rosen, K. (1970) *Studien zur Darstellungskunst und Glaubwürdigkeit des Ammianus Marcellinus*, Bonn, Habelt Verlag.
- (2013) *Konstantin der Große. Kaiser zwischen Machtpolitik und Religion*, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta.

Bibliography

- Ross, A. J. (2016) 'Libanius the historian? Praise and the presentation of the past in *Or.* 59', *GRBS* 56: 293–320.
- Roueché, C. (1989) *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity: The Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions Including Texts from the Excavations at Aphrodisias*, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
- (2009) 'The Kuretenstraße. The imperial presence in late antiquity' in *Neue Forschungen zur Kuretenstrasse von Ephesos: Akten des Symposiums für Hilke Thür vom 13. Dezember 2006 an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, Austrian Academy of Sciences Press: 155–70.
- Rougé, J. (1966) *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, Introduction, critical edn, trans., notes and commentary by Jean Rougé, Paris, Éditions du Cerf.
- Roux, M. (2014) 'Le devenir de l'administration civile en Gaule et en Hispanie de 284 à 536 après J.-C.. Transformations des institutions romaines, mises en place des royaumes romano-barbares et mutations des élites', PhD dissertation, Nanterre, Université Paris Ouest Nanterre.
- Rubin, Z. (1998) 'Pagan propaganda during the usurpation of Magnentius (350–353)', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17: 124–41.
- Rüpke, J. (2015) '9. Roles and individuality in the Chronograph of 354' in E. Rebillard and J. Rüpke (eds) *Group Identity and Religious Individualism in Late Antiquity*, CUA studies in Early Christianity, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press: 247–69.
- Ruggini, L. C. (2003) 'Rome in late antiquity: Clientship, urban topography, and prosopography', *CPh* 98: 366–82.
- Sabbah, G. (1978) *La méthode d'Ammien Marcellin. Recherches sur la construction du discours historique dans les Res gestae*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres
- Şahin, S. (2015) 'Spätromisch-frühbyzantinische Inschriften aus Perge in Pamphylien' in A. Rhoby (ed.) *Inscriptions from Byzantium and Beyond*, Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 177–86.
- Salvo, L. de (2005) 'Disposizioni fiscali nella testimonianza di Temistio' in *Atti dell'Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana. XV Convegno Internazionale in onore di Carlo Castello* (= Pubblicazioni dell'Università degli Studi di Perugia), Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, Naples, Perugia: 131–44.
- Salway, R. W. B. (1995) 'The Creation of the Roman State, AD 200–340. Social and Administrative Aspects', DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.
- (2007a) 'Constantine *Augustos* (Not *Sebastos*)' in J. F. Drinkwater and R. W. B. Salway (eds) *Wolf Liebeschuetz Reflected. Essays Presented by Colleagues, Friends, and Pupils*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies suppl. 91, London, University of London Institute of Classical Studies: 37–50.
- (2007b) 'The praetorian prefecture of Africa under Constantine. A phantom?', in M. M. i Olivé, G. Baratta and A. G. Almagro (eds)

Bibliography

- XII Congressus Internationalis epigraphiae graecae et latinae. Provinciae imperii romani inscriptionibus descriptae, Barcelona, 3–8 Septembris 2002*, part II, Monografies de la Secció Històrico-Archeològica X, Barcelona, Victor Iguual: 1282–6.
- (2008) ‘Roman consuls, imperial politics, and Egyptian papyri: The consulates of 325 and 344 AD’, *JLA* 1.2: 278–310.
- (2012a) ‘Words and deeds: Julian in the epigraphic record’ in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds) *Emperor and Author. The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales: 137–57.
- (2012b) ‘There but not there. Constantinople in the *Itinerarium Burdigalense*’ in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 293–324.
- (2015) ‘Redefining the Roman imperial elite in the fourth century AD’ in D. Okoń and P. Briks (eds) *Elites in the Ancient World*, Szczecin, Praca Zbiorowa: 189–220.
- Salzman, M. R. (1990) *On Roman Time. The Codex Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley/Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- (2000) ‘Elite realities and mentalités. The making of a western Christian aristocracy’, *Arethusa* 33.3: 347–62.
- (2002) *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy. Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- (2006) ‘Symmachus and his father. Patriarchy and patrimony in the late Roman senatorial elite’ in R. Lizzi Testa (ed.) *Le trasformazioni delle élites in età tardoantica. Atti del Convegno Internazionale. Perugia, 15–16 marzo 2004*, Rome, L’Erma di Bretschneider: 357–75.
- (2016) ‘Constantine and the Roman senate. Conflict, cooperation, and concealed resistance’ in M. R. Salzman, M. Sághy and R. Lizzi Testa (eds) *Pagans and Christians in Late Antique Rome*, Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press: 11–45.
- Salzman, M. R., and Roberts, M. J. (2012) *The Letters of Symmachus*, book 1, trans. by Michele Renee Salzman and Michael Roberts, general introduction and commentary by Michele Renee Salzman, Leiden/Boston, MA, Society of Biblical Literature.
- Sandwell, I. (2007) *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christian in Antioch*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2009) ‘Libanius’ social networks. Understanding the social structure of the later Roman empire’ in I. Malkin, C. Constantakopoulou and K. Panagopoulou (eds) *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*, London, Routledge: 129–43.
- Sandwell, I., and Huskinson, J. (eds) (2004) *Culture and Society in Later Roman Antioch. Papers from a Colloquium, London, 15 December 2001*, Oxford, Oxbow Books.

Bibliography

- Saquete, J. C. (2000) 'Septimius Acindynus, corrector Tusciae et Umbriae. Notes on a new inscription from Augusta Emerita (Mérida, Spain)', *ZPE* 129: 281–6.
- Sarris, P. (2002) 'The eastern Roman empire from Constantine to Heraclius (306–641)' in C. Mango (ed.) *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 19–70.
- (2004) 'Rehabilitating the great estate: Aristocratic property and economic growth in the late antique East' in W. Bowden, L. Lavan and C. Machado (eds) *Recent Research in the Late Antique Countryside*, Leiden, Brill: 55–71.
- Schamp, J. (2000) 'Himérius de Prousius', *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 3: 708–42.
- Scharf, R. (1994) *Comites und comitiva primi ordinis*, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- Scheithauer, A. (2000) *Kaiserliche Bautätigkeit in Rom. Das Echo in der antiken Literatur*, Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 32, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- Schlange-Schöningen, H. (1995) *Kaisertum und Bildungswesen im spätantiken Konstantinopel*, Historia Einzelschriften 94, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- Schlinkert, D. (1994) 'Der Hofeunuch in der Spätantike', *Hermes* 122: 342–59.
- (1996) *Ordo senatorius und nobilitas. Die Konstitution des Senatsadels in der Spätantike*, Hermes Einzelschriften 72, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- (1998) 'Dem Kaiser folgen. Kaiser, Senatsadel und höfische Funktionseelite (*comites consistoriani*) von der "Tetrarchie" Diokletians bis zum Ende des konstantinischen Dynastie' in A. Winterling (ed.) *Comitatus. Beiträge zur Erforschung des spätantiken Kaiserhofes*, Berlin, de Gruyter: 132–59.
- Schmidt-Hofner, S. (2008) *Reagieren und Gestalten: Der Regierungstil des spätrömischen Kaisers am Beispiel der Gesetzgebung Valentinians I.*, Vestigia 58, Munich, C. H. Beck.
- (2010) 'Ehrensachen. Ranggesetzgebung, Elitenkonkurrenz und die Funktionen des Rechts in der Spätantike', *Chiron* 40: 209–43.
- (2012) 'Trajan und die symbolische Kommunikation bei kaiserlichen Rombesuchen in der Spätantike' in F. Behrwald and C. Witschel (eds) *Rom in der Spätantike. Historische Erinnerung im spätantiken Raum*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 51, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 33–59.
- Schneider, H. (2007) *Eusebius von Caesarea. De Vita Constantini. Über das Leben Konstantins. Griechisch-Deutsch*, Introduction by Bruno Bleckmann, notes and commentary by Horst Schneider, *Fontes Christiani* 83, Turnhout, Brepols.
- Scholten, H. (1998) 'Römische Diplomatie im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr. Eine Doppelstrategie des praefectus praetorio Orientis Musonianus?', *Historia* 47: 454–67.

Bibliography

- (1998) 'Der oberste Hofeunuch. Die politische Effizienz eines gesellschaftlich Diskriminierten' in A. Winterling (ed.) *Comitatus. Beiträge zur Erforschung des spätantiken Kaiserhofes*, Berlin, de Gruyter: 52–73.
- Schulten, P. N. (1979) *Die Typologie der römischen Konsekrationsprägungen*, Frankfurt, Numismatischer Verlag Schulten.
- Scrinari, V. Santa Maria (1991) *Il Laterano Imperiale I. Dalla aedes Laterani alla Domus Faustae*, Vatican City, Pontificio Istituto di archeologia Cristiana.
- Seeck, O. (1884) 'Die Inschrift des Ceionius Rufinus Albinus', *Hermes* 19: 186–97.
- (1897–1921) *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 1–9, Stuttgart, Metzler.
- (1898) 'Zu den Festmünzen Constantins und seiner Familie', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 21: 17–65, pls 2–3.
- (1919) *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr. Vorarbeit zu einer Prosopographie der christlichen Kaiserzeit*, Stuttgart, Metzler.
- Seiler, E.-M. (1998) *Konstantius II bei Libanius. Eine kritische Untersuchung des überlieferten Herrscherbildes*, Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 789, Frankfurt am Main, Peter-Lang Verlagsgruppe.
- Sfameni, C. (2004) 'Residential villas in late antique Italy. Continuity and change' in W. Bowden, L. Lavan and C. Machado (eds) *Recent Research in the Late Antique Countryside*, Leiden, Brill: 335–75.
- Sguaitamatti, L. (2012) *Das spätantike Konsulat*, Paradosis 53, Freiburg, Academic Press.
- Shepardson, C. (2014) *Controlling Contested Places. Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Sinningen, W. G. (1959) 'Two branches of the late Roman secret service', *AJPH* 80: 238–54.
- (1962) 'Three administrative changes ascribed to Constantius II', *AJPH* 83: 369–82.
- Sirks, A. J. B. (1991) *Food for Rome. The Legal Structure of the Transportation and Processing of Supplies for the Imperial Distribution in Rome and Constantinople*, Amsterdam, Studia Amstelodamensia.
- (1993) 'Did the late Roman government try to tie people to their profession or status?', *Tyche* 8: 159–75.
- (2003) 'Die Nomination für die städtischen Ämter im römischen Reich' in A. Cordes, J. Rückert and R. Schulze (eds) *Stadt, Gemeinde, Genossenschaft. Festschrift für Gerhard Dilcher zum 70. Geburtstag*, Berlin, Erich Schmidt Verlag: 13–22.
- (2008) 'The colonate in Justinian's reign', *JRS* 98: 120–43.

Bibliography

- Sironen, E. (1994) 'Life and administration of late Roman Attica in the light of public inscriptions' in P. Castrén (ed.) *Post-Herulian Athens. Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens AD 267–529*, Papers and Monographs of the Institute at Athens 1, Helsinki, Suomen Ateenan-instituutin saatio: 15–61.
- (2001) 'Lateinische Ehreninschriften für Constantin den Großen und seine Nachfolger und andere Inschriften der Spätzeit aus Attika', *ZPE* 136: 257–78.
- (2008) *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores*, pars V, *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Herulorum incursionem et Imp. Mauricii tempora*, IG editio minor, II–III, pars 5, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Skinner, A. (2000) 'The birth of a "Byzantine" senatorial perspective', *Arethusa* 33: 363–77.
- (2008) 'The early development of the Senate of Constantinople', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 32: 128–48.
- (2013) 'Political mobility in the later Roman empire', *Past and Present* 218: 17–53.
- (2015) 'Violence at Constantinople in A.D. 341–2 and Themistius, Oration 1', *JRS* 105: 234–49.
- Smith, R. (2007a) 'A lost historian of Alexander "descended from Alexander", and read by Julian? Praxagoras of Athens reviewed in the light of Attic epigraphy', *Historia* 56: 356–80.
- (2007b) 'The imperial court of the late Roman empire, c.AD 300–c.AD 450' in A. J. S. Spawforth (ed.) *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 157–233.
- Spawforth, A. J. S. (2002) 'Italian elements among Roman knights and senators from old Greece', *BCH Suppl.* 41: 101–7.
- Squire, M., and Wienand, J. (eds) (2017) *Morphogrammata: The Lettered Art of Optatian. Figuring Cultural Transformation in the Age of Constantine*, Paderborn, Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Stein, E. (1928/1968) *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, 2 vols, reprint of 2nd edn, trans. Jean-Rémy Palanque, Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.
- Stephenson, P. (2009) *Constantine. Unconquered Emperor, Christian Victor*, New York, Quercus.
- Stern, H. (1953) *Le Calendrier de 354. Étude sur son texte et ses illustrations*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale.
- Straub, J. (1955) 'Konstantins Verzicht auf den Gang zum Kapitol', *Historia* 4: 297–313 (= (1972) *Regeneratio Imperii*, 1, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: 100–18).
- (1964) *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike*, Darmstadt, De Gruyter (reprinted edn from 1939).
- Swift, L. J., and Oliver, J. H. (1962) 'Constantius II on Flavius Philippus', *AJPh* 83: 247–64.
- Szidat, J. (1981) *Historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus, Buch XX–XXI*, 2, *Die Verhandlungsphase*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 38, Wiesbaden, Steiner Verlag

Bibliography

- (1997) 'Die Usurpation Julians. Ein Sonderfall' in F. Paschoud, J. Szidat and T. D. Barnes (eds) *Usurpationen in der Spätantike*, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 63–70.
- (2010) *Usurpator tanti nominis. Kaiser und Usurpator in der Spätantike (337–476 n. Chr.)*, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag.
- Talbert, R. J. A. (1984) *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Tantillo, I. (1997) *La prima orazione di Giuliano a Costanzo. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- (2014) 'Memmius Vitrasius Orfitus. Signo Honorius?' *ZPE* 190: 271–8.
- Teitler, H. C. (1985) *Notarii and Exceptores: An Inquiry into Role and Significance of Shorthand Writers in the Imperial and Ecclesiastical Bureaucracy of the Roman Empire (from the Early Principate to c.450 AD)*, Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 1, Amsterdam, J. C. Gieben Publisher.
- (1992) 'Image and reality' in J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst and H. C. Teitler (eds) *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Amsterdam, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences: 117–22.
- Thompson, E. A. (1947) *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (1956) 'Constantine, Constantius II, and the lower Danube frontier', *Hermes* 84: 372–81.
- Thompson, G. L. (2005) 'Constantius II and the first removal of the Altar of Victory' in J.-J. Aubert (ed.) *A Tall Order. Writing the Social History of the Ancient World: Essays in Honor of W.V. Harris*, Munich, De Gruyter: 85–106.
- Tinnefeld, F. (1977) *Die frühbyzantinische Gesellschaft. Struktur, Gegensätze, Spannungen*, Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Tougher, S. (1999) 'Ammianus and the eunuchs' in J. W. Drijvers and D. Hunt (eds) *The Late Roman World and its Historian. Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London, Routledge: 64–71.
- (2007) *Julian the Apostate*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- (2012a) 'Imperial blood. Family relationships in the dynasty of Constantine the Great' in M. Harlow and L. L. Lovén (eds) *Families in the Roman and Late Antique World*, London/New York, Bloomsbury Academic: 181–98.
- (2012b) 'Reading between the lines. Julian's first panegyric on Constantius II' in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds) *Emperor and Author. The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales: 19–34.
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1945) Review of Andreas Alföldi (1942/3) *Die Kontorniaten: Ein verkanntes Propagandamittel der stadtrömischen heidnischen Aristokratie in ihrem Kampfe gegen das christliche Kaisertum, Budapest*, *JRS* 35: 115–21.

Bibliography

- (1947) 'Roma and Constantinopolis in late-antique art from 312 to 365', *JRS* 37: 135–44.
- Tränkle, H. (1976) 'Der Caesar Gallus bei Ammian', *Museum Helveticum* 33: 162–79.
- Van Dam, R. (2002) *Kingdom of Snow. Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- (2003a) *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- (2003b) *Becoming Christian. The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- (2007) *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2010) *Rome and Constantinople. Rewriting Roman History during Late Antiquity*, Waco, TX, Baylor University Press.
- (2011) *Remembering Constantine at the Milvian Bridge*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Van Hoof, L. (2010) 'Greek rhetoric and the later Roman empire. The bubble of the "Third Sophistic"', *AntTard* 18: 211–24.
- (2011) 'Libanius and the EU presidency. Career moves in the *Autobiography*' in O. Lagacherie and P.-L. Malosse (eds) *Libanius, le premier humaniste. Études en hommage à Bernard Schouler. Actes du colloque de Montpellier, 18–20 mars 2010*, *Cardo* 9, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso: 193–206.
- Vanderspoel, J. (1989) 'The "Themistius Collection" of commentaries on Plato and Aristotle', *Phoenix* 43: 162–4.
- (1995) *Themistius and the Imperial Court. Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia From Constantius to Theodosius*, Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press.
- (2012) 'A tale of two cities. Themistius on Rome and Constantinople' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 223–40.
- Varner, E. R. (2012) 'Roman authority, imperial authoriality, and Julian's artistic program' in N. Baker-Brian and S. Tougher (eds) *Emperor and Author. The Writings of Julian the Apostate*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales: 183–211.
- Vera, D. (1986) 'Simmaco e le sue proprietà. Struttura e funzionamento di un patrimonio aristocratico del quarto secolo d.C.' in F. Paschoud (ed.) *Colloque genevois sur Symmache. A l'occasion du mille six centième anniversaire du conflit de l'autel de la Victoire*, Paris, Belles Lettres: 231–55.
- (1995) 'Dalla "villa perfecta" alla villa di Palladio. Sulle trasformazioni del sistema agrario in Italia fra Principato e Dominato', *Athenaeum* 83: 189–211, 331–56.
- Verdickt, M. (1968) 'Les proconsulats d'Asie et d'Achaïe aux IV^e–Ve siècles après J.C. (A propos de deux chapitres de la *Notitia dignitatum*)',

Bibliography

- Recherches de philologie et de linguistique*, 2nd ser., Louvain, Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université catholique de Louvain: 167–208.
- Verduchi, P. (1995) 'Equus: Constantinus' in E. M. Steinby (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, 2, Rome, J. Paul Getty Trust Publications: 226–7.
- Veayne, P. (2010) *When our World Became Christian, 312–394*, trans. by J. Lloyd, Cambridge, Polity.
- Vogler, C. (1979) *Constance II et l'administration impériale*, Strasbourg, AECR.
- Völker, H. (2003) *Himerius. Reden und Fragmente*, Introduction, notes and commentary by Harald Völker, Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1982) 'Civilis Princeps. Between citizen and king', *JRS* 72: 32–48.
- Wankel, H. (1979) *Die Inschriften von Ephesos I, Die Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 11*, Bonn, Habelt Verlag.
- Wardman, A. E. (1994) 'Usurpers and internal conflicts in the fourth century AD', *Historia* 33: 220–37.
- Ward-Perkins, B. (2012) 'The rise of Constantinople. Old and New Rome compared' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds) *Two Romes. Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 53–78.
- Warmington, B. (1999) 'Some Constantinian reference in Ammianus' in J. W. Drijvers and D. Hunt (eds) *The Late Roman World and its Historian. Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London, Routledge: 166–77.
- Watts, E. J. (2006) *City and School in Late-Antique Athens and Alexandria*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- (2015) *The Final Pagan Generation*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Weiss, P. (1975) *Consistorium und Comites Consistoriani. Untersuchungen zur Hofbeamtenschaft des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Würzburg, Dissertation Universität Würzburg.
- Weisweiler, J. (2011) 'The price of integrations. State and élite in Symmachus' correspondence' in P. Eich, S. Schmidt-Hofner and C. Wieland (eds) *Der wiederkehrende Leviathan. Staatlichkeit und Staatswerdung in Spätantike und Früher Neuzeit*. Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter: 346–75.
- (2012a) 'Inscribing imperial power. Letters from emperors in late-antique Rome' in F. Behrwald and C. Witschel (eds) *Rom in der Spätantike. Historische Erinnerung im spätantiken Raum*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 51, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 309–30.
- (2012b) 'Honorific statues, imperial power and senatorial identity in late-antique Rome', *JRA* 25: 319–50.
- (2015a) 'Domesticating the senatorial elite. Universal monarchy and transregional aristocracy in the fourth century AD' in J. Wienand

Bibliography

- (ed.) *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 17–41.
- (2015b) ‘Unreliable witness. Failings of the narrative in Ammianus Marcellinus’ in L. Van Hoof and P. Van Nuffelen (eds) *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD. Performing Parideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self*, Leiden, Brill: 103–33.
- Wenzel, A. (2010) ‘Libanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the ideal of Athens in late antiquity’, *JLA* 3.2: 264–85.
- Wesch-Klein (2001) ‘Bithynia, Pontus et Bithynia, Bithynia et Pontus. Ein Provinzname im Wandel der Zeit’, *ZPE* 136: 251–6.
- Westall, R. (2015) ‘Constantius II and the Basilica of St. Peter in the Vatican’, *Historia* 64.2: 205–42.
- Whitby, M. (ed.) (1998) *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Boston, MA, Brill.
- (1999) ‘Images of Constantius’ in J. W. Drijvers and D. Hunt (eds) *The Late Roman World and its Historian. Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London, Routledge: 77–88.
- Wickham, C. (2005) *Framing the Early Middle Ages. Europe and the Mediterranean 400–800*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Wiemer, H.-U. (1994) ‘Libanius on Constantine’, *CQ* 44: 511–24.
- (1995) *Libanios und Julian. Studien zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Politik im vierten Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Munich, C. H. Beck.
- Wienand, J. (2012a) *Der Kaiser als Sieger. Metamorphosen triumphaler Herrschaft unter Constantin I*, Klio Beihefte (NS) 19, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- (2012b) ‘Die Poesie des Bürgerkriegs. Das constantinische *aureum saeculum* in den *carmina Optatians* ’ in G. Bonamente, N. Lenski and R. Lizzi Testa (eds) *Constantino prima e dopo Constantino*, Bari, Edizione Puglia: 419–44.
- (2012c) ‘The making of an imperial dynasty. Optatian’s *carmina figurate* and the development of the Constantinian *domus divina* (317–26 AD)’, *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 3: 225–65.
- (2015) ‘The empire’s golden shade. Icons of sovereignty in an age of transition [= Epilogue]’ in J. Wienand (ed.) *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the 4th Century AD*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 423–51.
- (2016) ‘The law’s avenger. Emperor Julian in Constantinople’ in H. Börm, M. Mattheis and J. Wienand (eds) *Civil War in Ancient Greece and Rome. Contexts of Disintegration and Reintegration*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 58, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 347–66
- (2017) ‘Publilius Optatianus Porphyrius. The man and his book’ in M. Squire and J. Wienand (eds) *Morphogrammata: The Lettered Art of Optatian. Figuring Cultural Transformation in the Age of Constantine*, Paderborn, Wilhelm Fink Verlag: 121–63.

Bibliography

- Wiewiorowski, J. (2015) *The Judiciary of Diocesan Vicars in the Later Roman Empire*, Adam Mickiewicz University Law Books 1, Poznan, Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Wilkinson, K. W. (2009) 'Palladas and the Age of Constantine', *JRS* 99: 36–60.
- Wintjes, J. (2005) *Das Leben des Libanius. Historische Studien der Universität Würzburg*, 2, Rahden/Westfalen, Verlag Marie Leidorf.
- (2006) 'Libanius and Himerius' in À. González Gálvez and P.-L. Malosse (eds) *Mélanges A. F. Norman*, Topoi Supplement 7, Lyon, Éditions de Boccard: 231–41.
- Wissowa, G. (1912) *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2nd edn, Munich, C. H. Beck.
- Witschel, C. (2012) 'Alte und neue Erinnerungsmodi in den spätantiken Inschriften Roms' in F. Behrwald and C. Witschel (eds) *Rom in der Spätantike. Historische Erinnerung im spätantiken Raum*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 51, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag: 357–406.
- Woods, D. (1999) 'A Persian at Rome. Ammianus and Eunapius, *Frag.* 68' in J. W. Drijvers and D. Hunt (eds) *The Late Roman World and its Historian. Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, London, Routledge: 156–65.
- (2005) 'Malalas, "Constantius", and a church-inscription from Antioch', *Vigilae Christianae* 59: 54–62.
- (2011) 'Numismatic evidence and the succession of Constantine I', *Numismatic Chronicle* 171: 187–96, with plate 26.
- (2012) 'Flavius Bonosus and the consuls of AD 344', *CQ* 62.2: 895–8.
- Woytek, B. (2010) *Die Reichsprägung des Kaisers Traianus (98–117)*, Moneta Imperii Romani 14, Vienna, Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Wright, D. H. (1987) 'The true face of Constantine the Great' in *DOP* 41, *Studies on Art and Archeology in Honor of Ernst Kitzinger on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, Washington, DC, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection: 493–507.
- Wright, W. C. (1980) *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, with an English trans. by Wilmer Care Wright, 3 vols, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Zuckerman, C. (2002) 'Sur la liste de Vérone et la province de Grande Arménie, la division de l'empire et la date de création des diocèses' in V. Déroche, D. Feissel, C. Morrisson et al. (eds) *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, Travaux et Mémoires 14, Paris, Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance: 617–37.

INDEX

- Ablabius, Flavius (praetorian prefect), 65–9, 92, 150, 152, 247
- absenteeism, *see* municipal council, senate
- Acacius (governor), 74
- Achaea, 24, 31, 37, 43, 79n137, 87, 94, 99, 101, 114, 116, 127, 135, 186, 217, 219, 227–30, 265, 314, 320
- Acindynus, Septimius (praetorian prefect), 74, 91–5, 100–2, 113, 114, 122, 163
- Adelphius, *see* Celsinus
- adventus* (imperial), 15, 28, 129, 130, 165, 288, 328
- Aeacus (Aeginetan hero), 101
- Aegina, 101, 114, 218
- Aemilia et Liguria (province), 32, 100
- Aequitas (Fairness), *see* imperial qualities
- Africa (North), 22, 25, 26, 29–32, 45, 60, 74, 76, 98–9, 102, 104, 105–10, 115, 118, 137, 177, 178, 183, 184, 187, 220, 229, 254, 266, 282, 286, 314
- Agilo (*magister peditum*), 187, 251
- Albinus, Ceionius Rufius (urban prefect and cos. 335), 21, 23–5, 36–9, 107, 283
- Aletrium (Campania), 61
- Alexander (proconsul), 100, 114, 131–3, 140
- Alexander the Great, 5, 112, 162–4
- Alexander, L. Domitius (usurper), 31
- Alexandria (Egypt), 103, 162, 199–200, 210, 296n89, 307, 330
- Alexandria Troas, 197
- Altar of Victory, *see* religion
- Alypius, Fl. Areianus (equestrian governor), 105, 225n64
- ambassador, 74, 93, 126, 200–4, 271, 279
- Ammianus (Marcellinus) (historian), 4, 96, 134n60, 141n105, 175, 180–3, 204n127, 248n160, 279, 283, 288, 290, 291, 302, 305, 307, 323
- Ampelius, Publius (*magister officiorum* and proconsul of Achaea), 127, 217–18, 282
- Anastasia (sister of Constantine), 32–3
- Anatolius (the Elder), 102, 115, 187
- Anatolius (the Younger), 103, 105, 123, 219, 225
- Ancyra, 63, 135, 223, 253
- Andrew (apostle), 262
- anniversary (imperial)
- decennalia*, 15n9, 29, 35, 129
 - quindeccennalia*, 130, 159
 - tricennalia*, 13, 41, 304
 - vicennalia*, 15–16, 37, 43, 5154f 2.1, 77, 80, 119, 129, 271, 281, 287–92, 299, 304n127, 306
 - vota*, 119n1, 129n36, 148n124, 158–60
- annona* (taxation), 85, 137, 179, 194, 250, 309
- Anthemius (cos. 405), 253
- Anthemius (emperor), 253
- Antioch, 19, 43, 64, 75, 89, 218, 222, 225, 226, 230, 251, 253, 256, 260, 282, 296, 299, 310, 318, 328, 331
- army in, 127–8
- baths, 123, 124, 253
- circus, 123, 128
- education in, 227, 256, 266
- entertainments, 123–4, 128
- and Gallus, 178–89, 205–7, 287, 320
- games, 123–4
- Golden Church, 122, 156
- harbour, 121–2, 128

Index

- Antioch (*cont.*)
 as imperial centre under Constantius II,
 5, 85, 112, 113, 120, 121–31, 274, 310,
 318, 326
 Julian's critique of Constantius'
 sojourn in, 123–6
 Olympian Games, 124
 as a place of government, 21, 92, 104,
 106, 111, 118, 127–8, 194, 270
 as a place for imperial celebrations,
 128–31, 156–66
Antiochos (of Libanius), 122
 Antoninus, C. Matrinius Aurelius
 (equestrian *pontifex gentis*
Flaviae), 25
 Anullinus, C. Annius (urban
 prefect), 28, 74
 Aphrodite, 263
 Apollinaris (*consularis Phoenices*), 207
 Apollinaris (*cura palatii*), 207
 Apollo, 273, 297
Apologia contra Arianos (of Athanasius
 of Alexandria), 192
 Arabia (province), 20, 104, 105
 Araxius (proconsul), 187–8, 218, 234, 251
 Arborius, Aemilius Magnus Arborius
 (teacher), 151
 Archelaus (*comes Orientis*), 97
 Argos, 31
 Argyrius (*curialis* of Antioch), 124
 Aristaenetus (urban prefect), 252
 Aristaenetus (*vicarius Pietatis*), 226
 Arles (Arleate), 154, 281, 304
 Armenia, 26, 104, 224n60
 Arsenius (*ex vicarius*), 238–9
Artemii Passio, 180n37
 Asia, 261, 263
 proconsulship of, 20–5, 31, 42, 74, 75,
 91, 98–9, 107, 108, 132, 171, 181–5,
 197, 218–19, 247, 283, 314, 317, 332
 Asia Minor, 23, 27, 90, 91, 104, 198,
 214, 265
 Asiana (diocese), 68, 101, 114, 183, 205, 252
 Assyria, 124
 Athanasius of Alexandria (bishop), 192,
 199–200, 201–2, 209
 Athens, 100, 104, 114, 136, 137–9, 144,
 186, 263
 and Constans, 115–17
 and Constantine, 115–17
 Attica, 93, 138
Auctoritas, *see* senate
Augostos, *see* *Sebastos* (imperial
 titulature)
 Augusta Emerita, 92, 240
 Augustamnica (province), 105, 225
 Aurelian (emperor), 20, 25
 Aurelianus, Julius (*consularis* in Pontus
 and Bithynia), 22
 Aurelius Victor (historian), 4n10, 25, 44,
 47–8, 58, 152n139
Autobiography (of Libanius), 125–6, 135,
 137, 144–5, 195
 Balkan (region/peninsula), 30, 179, 186, 229
 banquet, 51, 125
 Barnes, Timothy, 81, 100, 112, 200, 205
 Bassianus (senator, brother-in-law of
 Constatine), 32–4
 Bassianus (son of Thalassius), 251
 Bassus, Junius *signo* Theotecnius (urban
 prefect), 296–7, 296n88
 Bauli (Campania), 93
 Bemarchius (orator), 122n11, 137, 139,
 140, 156
 Berytus, 90, 95–6, 102, 187, 188
 bishop, *see* religion
 Bithynia (province), 22, 195, 214, 224,
 226, 287
 Bleckmann, Bruno, 174, 204, 209
 Bonfils, Giovanni de, 112
 Bonosus, Flavius, 110–11
 Bosphorus, 13, 22, 27, 76, 133, 173, 232,
 261, 301
boule, *see* municipal council
bouleutai/βουλευταί, *see* municipal
 council
bouleuterion/βουλευτήριον, *see* municipal
 council
 Bradbury, Scott, 231
 Britain, 87, 89, 181, 183
 bureaucracy (imperial), 3, 127, 247, 321
 Byzacena (province), 29, 104
 Cabouret, Bernadette, 231
 Caesar(ship), 15, 33, 56, 106, 117, 120,
 122, 129, 130, 136, 148, 151, 153,
 158, 172–6, 178–83, 188, 203, 206,

Index

- 220, 254, 285–6, 291, 301, 304, 308,
320, 331
- Caesarius (brother of Gregory of
Nazianzus), 268–70
- Cameron, Alan, 25, 94
- Cameron, Averil, 49
- Campania (province), 23, 32, 61, 62, 93,
98n57, 104, 280, 298n101
- Campus Ardiensis, 30
- Cappadocia, 103, 127n31, 136, 137
- Caria (province), 22, 183, 184, 224
- Catullinus, Aconius Philomathius
(cos. 349), 74, 113
- Celsinus, Aurelius (urban prefect),
60, 278
- Celsinus, Clodius Adelphius (urban
prefect), 98–9, 278
- ensor* (title), 80, 81
- ensuales*, see *senate*
- Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi*
(by Faltonia Proba), 177
- Cerealis, Neratius (cos. 358), 179, 253,
278–80, 289, 293
- Chabrias (Athenian general), 257n208
- chair (teaching), see *education*
- Chalcedon, 181, 205, 331
- Chalcis, 218
- chariot
imperial, 129, 130, 289
race, 124, 143n113, 147, 260
- Chastagnol, André, 40, 59, 66, 69–72,
99, 142, 237
- Chrestus (teacher), 266
- Chronicon Paschale*, 58, 262n234
- Chrysantius, Tannonius (*vir*
perfectissimus), 62
- Chrysopolis, 68, 261
- Chytri (Cyprus), 198
- Cilicia (province), 104, 105, 224,
254, 328
- citizen(ship) (of Constantinople),
see *senate*
- civil war
against western usurpers, 175–80,
189–213, 279, 304–8, 326
Constantine II against Constans, 87
- civilis princeps*, see *imperial qualities*
- civilitas*, see *imperial qualities*
- clarissimus* (*vir*), see *senatorial rank*
- clarus/clari*, 62
- Clearchus (urban prefect), 231, 264
- clementia*, see *imperial qualities*
- Clementius, Fl. Taurus Clementinus
Armonius (cos. 513), 254
- Codex Calendar of 354, 7, 16, 35, 278,
284, 292n66
- cognomen* (imperial), 125n24, 192–3
- coinage
bronze, 89, 153, 157, 158, 164
of Constans I, 89, 148–66
of Constantine I, 15–18, 5154f2.1, 315
of Constantine II, 148–56, 160–2
of Constantius II, 88–90, 120f4.1,
129–31, 148–66, 303, 306, 319
gold, 16–18, 51–4, 120f4.1, 129–31,
277, 289, 303, 315
legend, 16, 18, 89, 119, 130, 148, 153–5,
157–8, 159, 164
medallion, 16–18, 51–4, 129–31,
167n184, 303
siliqua, 130, 160–2
silver, 164
twin-city motif, 119, 165
- Cologne, 285
- comes Orientis*, 21, 22, 24, 74, 77, 94, 96,
97, 102, 107, 122, 126, 174, 179n36,
181, 188, 220, 254, 283, 286, 331
- comes sacrarum largitionum*, 182
- comitatus*, see *imperial court*
- comites* (imperial companions)
comes Flaviales, 77, 283
comes primi ordinis (*intra palatium*),
76, 94, 174, 279
comes secundi ordinis, 75
and traditional social ranks, 76
- commemoration
of Constantine I, 148–66, 149f4.2,
272–5, 287–9, 303–8
of Constantius' victories, 111–13, 128–
31, 162–4, 197–211, 257, 287–92,
299–302, 303–11
- Commentarii de bello Gallico*, 285
- confiscations, 75n112, 174, 204n127,
280, 282n16, 293
- Conscript Fathers (*patres conscripti*),
see *senate*
- consecratio(n), 149, 155n149, 158, 262
- consistorium*, see *imperial court*

Index

- Constans I (emperor), 9, 25n50, 60, 66,
 72, 85–91, 94–6, 99, 101, 107–11,
 113–18, 121, 128–30, 148, 150–3,
 156–68, 171–5, 193, 208–10, 291,
 293, 298, 306, 310, 317–20
 commemoration of Constantine I,
 160–2
 and Constantine II, 86–7
 Constans, L. Castrius (*consularis*
Phrygiae et Cariae), 22, 184
 Constantia (sister of Constantine),
 33, 41
 Constantina (sister of Constantius),
 174–6, 178–80, 287, 295
Constantine I (emperor)
 as *civilis princeps*, 16, 29
 and *clementia*, 28, 47n5
 and Constantinople, 22, 45–7, 57–72,
 148–66, 272–5
decennalia in Rome, 29
 and the eastern elites, 45–57, 73–82
 Father of the Emperors (*pater*
Augustorum), 14915of4.2, 153–6,
 157, 319
 funeral, 44, 131, 148–56, 167
 as *maximus Augustus*, 29
 and the senate of Rome, 13–44, 45–57,
 73–82, 287–9, 303–8
vicennalia in Rome, 15–20, 37
 Constantine II
 commemoration of Constantine I,
 148–56, 160–2
 and Constans, 86–7
 Constantinople
 Augusteion, 262
 baths, 260, 263
 Church of the Holy Apostles, 262
 education in, *see education*
 entertainments, 141–7, 243
 Forum of Constantine, 258, 262
 games, 69–72, 141–7, 165, 227–30,
 237–46, 319–20, 329, 357
 Hagia Eirene, 134
 Hagia Sophia, 262
 harbour, 260–2, 329, 330
 library, 263–4, 330
 mausoleum of Constantine, 151
 scriptorium, 263
 senate house, *see senate*
 symbol of Constantius’ legitimacy,
 131–67, 189–211
 Thermae Constantianae/Theodosian
 baths, 131, 134, 165, 259
Constantinopolis (Tyche), 5, 119, 261
 Constantius I (emperor), 20
 Constantius II (emperor)
 in Antioch, 91–113, 121–31, 328
civilis princeps, 258, 289
 and Constans, 85–118, 148–66, 208–10,
 293, 298, 306, 317–21
 and the Constantinian heritage, *see*
 commemoration of Constantine
 and Constantinople, 131–68, 180–213
 death and burial, 328–9
 and the eastern elites, 1–10, 99–107,
 180–213, 282–4, 313–28
 election to the Caesarship, 120
 as Father of the Senate, 7, 302, 323
 ideology (imperial), 5, 131, 148, 164,
 167, 268, 273
 imperial anniversaries, *see anniversary*
 (imperial)
 imperial image, *see coinage*,
 commemoration, Constantinople,
 imperial qualities, legitimacy,
 panegyrics, Rome
 imperial qualities of, *see imperial*
 qualities
 and imperial rivals, *see dynasty*
 (imperial), Constans, Constantine
 II, Dalmatius, Gallus, Julian,
 Magnentius, Nepotianus, Silvanus,
 trial (treason), Vetriciano
 love for Rome, 298–311
Maximus Augustus, 156–66
 and Philippus (praetorian prefect),
 189–207
 in Rome, 15, 277–312
 and the senate of Constantinople,
 141–7, 180–213, 313–28
 and the senate of Rome, 85–118, 128–31,
 162–4, 177–8, 277–312, 313–28
 and usurpations, *see Gallus, Julian*,
 Magnentius, Nepotianus, Silvanus,
 trial (treason), usurpation,
 Vetriciano
 Constantius, Julius (half-brother of
 Constantine), 15

Index

- consul(ship), 42n133, 203, 253, 254, 282, 285, 291, 296, 296n88, 301, 306, 331
consularis (governorship), 20, 22–4, 30, 54, 67, 75, 77, 94, 97–8, 100, 103, 104, 123, 126, 187, 188, 207, 218–19, 221–6, 230, 240, 249, 252, 254, 326, 331
 Corinth, 30, 115, 123n12, 187
 corn, *see* grain
 corn dole
 in Constantinople, 133
 in Rome, 280
corrector (governorship), 20, 23, 92, 98, 100n66, 199
 Crete, 65, 68
 Crimea, 133
 Crispus (Caesar and son of Constantine), 15n9, 74
cura palatii, 106, 207
 curial obligations, *see* municipal council
curialiscuriales, *see* municipal council
cursus honorum, *see* senate
 Cyanean (rocks), 261
 Cyprus, 197, 198, 225
 Cyriacus of Ancona, 198
 Cyrrhus (city), 299
 Cyzicus, 166
- Dagon, Gilbert, 40, 59, 214
 Daia, Maximinus (emperor), 29
 Dalmatius, Flavius (Caesar), 117, 150, 152, 153
 Dalmatius, Flavius (half-brother of Constantine), 80
 Danube, 186
 Daphne (Antioch), 123
 Datianus (*comes* and consul), 105, 111, 123, 179, 196, 247, 253, 296
Decennalia, *see* anniversary (imperial)
 dedication, *see* inscription
defensores, *see* senate
 Delphi, 115
Demegoria Constantii (by Constantius II), 216, 245, 267
 Demetrius (*consularis Phoenices*), 251
 diadem, 16, 52, 130, 150
diasemotatos/διασημότατος, *see* equestrian rank
 Didymus (teacher), 137
 Diocletian (emperor), 20, 22, 26, 32, 34, 43, 74, 134n60
 Dionysius, Flavius (*comes constitorianus*), 22, 67–9, 97, 150n130
 Dionysius, L. Aelius Helvius (urban prefect), 20, 22, 26, 68n88
 Dioscuri, 294
 divination, *see* religion
dokimasia, *see* senate
 Domitianus (*comes sacrarum largitionum* and praetorian prefect), 182, 185, 196, 207, 247
 Donatus (proconsul of Constantinople), 132
 Dulcitius, Aelius Claudius (notary and proconsul of Asia), 219, 247, 250, 331
 dynasty (imperial), 25, 146, 359
 and Constans, 148–66
 and Constantine II, 160–2, 272–5
 murders of, 337, 272–5
 as a source of imperial legitimacy, 86–7, 120f4.1, 148–66, 207–11, 272–5, 303–8
- Edessa, 147
 edict (imperial), 19, 234, 255
 education
 in Antioch, 135–7, 226–7
 in Athens, 100, 104, 115–17, 137–9, 186
 chair, 135–8, 139–41
 in Constantinople, 135–41, 264–6
 of Constantius II, 141n105
 grammarian, 264, 266
 of Julian, 330–1
 paideia, 141n105, 250, 264, 267
 salary of teachers, 135, 136, 140
 student, 137, 138–9, 182, 225–6, 231, 246, 264–6, 299n106
 teacher, 81, 116, 117n144, 135–41, 226–7, 265–6, 268, 281
 Egypt, 94, 103, 105, 116, 133, 135n72, 137, 174, 185, 225, 252
 Eleusian Mysteries, *see* religion
 embassy, 113, 125, 175–8, 201, 269, 279, 310
 Ephesus, 21n32, 90–1, 98, 99, 183–4, 194, 197–8, 202
 epigram, 26, 37, 93
 eponymos/ἐπώνυμος, 192

Index

- equus Romanus*, 51–4, 77, 315
equestrian rank/office, 2, 22–3, 25, 26, 29,
31–2, 49–57, 73–5, 97, 101, 104–7,
132, 145, 223–5, 313–17, 326, 332
perfectissimus/perfectissimate rank,
50–1, 54–7, 62–3, 74, 104, 316
δισσημότατος, 49–50, 56, 75, 105, 224
Errington, Malcolm, 275
estate, *see* property (landed)
Etruria (region), 26, 33
Euanthius (teacher), 266
Eugenius (father of Themistius), 249
Eugenius, Flavius (*magister officiorum*),
115, 291, 306
Eunapius of Sardis (historian), 18, 48,
116, 201, 305
Euphratensis (province), 223, 224, 251
Europa (province), 22, 24, 27, 54, 75,
131–3, 184, 214
Eusebia (empress), 224n57, 226, 282,
285, 288
Eutropia (sister of Constantine), 32,
152, 173
Evans-Grubbs, Judith, 71
Evanthius (teacher), 137
exile, 36–7, 87–9, 116, 132–3, 181, 201,
207, 252, 294, 331
Expositio totius mundi et gentium, 122,
123, 192, 286
Facundus (ex proconsul), 238–9
fasces, 238–9, 329
Father of the Emperors (*pater
Augustorum*/ Father of the
Augusti), *see* Constantine I
Fausta (mother of Constantius II), 34–5,
280–1, 301, 323, 331
Faustinus, Aur(elius) Fab(ius) (equestrian
governor), 56
Feissel, Denis, 103, 184, 190, 205
Felicianus, Flavius (*comes Orientis*),
152n137
Flaminia et Picenum (province), 32, 61,
100n66, 284
Flavianus, Ulpius (*consularis Aemiliae et
Liguriae*), 100
fleet, 31n78, 45n1, 178, 187
Florentius, Flavius (praetorian prefect),
126, 220, 254
foederati, 178
folles (tax), *see* senate
Fortunatus, Valerius (senator), 240
Franks (people), 89
funeral, 269, 297
of Constantine, *see* Constantine I
(emperor)
of Constantius II, *see* Constantius II
(emperor)
Galla (female member of a Roman
senatorial family), 32–3, 81, 94,
174, 178
Gallus (Caesar), 33, 136, 153, 172, 175–6,
178–83, 185, 189, 204–7, 212, 285,
286, 287, 320
Garbarino, Paolo, 239
Gaul, 18n17, 180n37, 182, 183, 203–4,
220, 254, 266, 279, 283, 285–6, 308,
310, 331
general (army), 133, 172, 174–5, 201, 320
gens Flavia, *see* dynasty (imperial)
Germany, 178, 183
globe, 16, 17, 89, 129, 303
gold, 13, 246, 263, 358
garments, 262
mosaic, 260
Gorgonius (chamberlain), 182
Goths (people), 53, 89, 133n56
grain, 116, 128, 133, 137, 185, 280,
297, 321
grammarian, *see* education
gratiarum actio, *see* oration
Greece, 45, 68, 93, 99–103, 106, 114–17,
118, 167, 185–7, 228, 229, 265,
314, 317
Greek (language), 75, 78–80, 91, 101,
135, 137, 140, 252, 256, 264, 302
Gregory of Nazianzus (bishop), 140, 268
Gregory of Nyssa (bishop), 251
Haemimontus (province), 214
Hall, Stuart, 49
Hannibalianus (*rex regum*), 153, 175
harbour, 91, 105, 182, 187, 297
in Antioch, *see* Antioch
in Constantinople, *see*
Constantinople
Harries, Jill, 100

Index

- Heather, Peter, 45, 50, 267
- Hecebolius (teacher), 138
- Helena (mother of Constantine I), 34, 41, 56, 81, 287–8
- Helena (sister of Constantius II), 285, 288, 308
- Helenopontus (province), 56
- Hellespont(us), 214, 224, 261
- Helpidius (*comes rei privatae*), 331
- Helpidius, Flavius (praetorian prefect), 196, 219, 247, 251
- Herculanus (*protector domesticus*), 182
- Hermogenes (*magister equitum*), 133, 182
- Hermogenes (urban prefect and praetorian prefect), 107–9, 171
- Hermogenes, Aurelius (urban prefect), 20
- Hermogenes, Flavius (praetorian prefect), 186, 217, 219, 236, 242
- Hierapolis (Phrygia Pacatiana), 183, 202, 205
- Hierocles, Fl. Antonius (*consularis Syriae*), 104, 106, 126, 251
- Hilarianus, Maecilius (urban prefect), 244n146, 282–3
- Hilarion (wife of Anatolius), 102
- Hilary of Poitiers (bishop), 88
- Himerius (orator), 100–1, 117n144, 138, 139–40, 176, 185–7, 217, 260–3, 265
- Hispellum (Umbria), 25
- History of the Arians* (of Athanasius of Alexandria), 199–200, 201–2, 209
- Honoratus (urban prefect), 188, 214, 220, 230, 239, 242, 286
- Honorius (emperor), 252
- honour(s) of rank, *see* equestrian rank, senatorial rank
- Hormisdas (Persian prince), 305
- house, 58, 67, 92–3, 123, 124, 182, 253, 270, 296
- Hyperechius (*curialis*), 223
- ideology (imperial), *see* Constantius II (emperor)
- Illyricum (prefecture), 102, 103, 106, 107, 109, 152n139, 171–5, 179, 181, 183, 187, 190n81, 204, 206, 217, 220, 226, 227–30, 233, 254, 268n260, 279, 283, 288, 301, 321
- imperial court, 35, 67, 76, 77, 150n130, 174, 283, 294n77
- imperial cult, *see* religion
- imperial qualities
- Aequitas (Fairness), 157–60
 - civilis princeps*, 16, 29, 257–8, 289
 - civilitas*, 29, 29n66, 330
 - clementia*, 28, 47n5, 280
 - pietas* (piety), 121, 153–7, 159, 164, 166–8, 209, 210, 226, 272
- inscription, 6–7, 19, 21, 24n43, 25, 38, 55, 56, 60–3, 85, 90–3, 95–6, 98n57, 101, 102, 115, 155, 167, 173, 183–4, 187, 189–95, 197–207, 212, 217, 218, 224, 303–5, 310, 314, 320
- Ionia, 101, 265n252
- Iphicrates (Athenian general), 257n208
- Isauria (province), 224
- Italicianus (*vicarius Asiana*), 252
- Italy, 20, 22, 31–2, 34, 39, 41, 43, 45, 61, 228n78, 252, 254, 269, 282, 286, 288, 309, 314
- Itinerarium Alexandri*, 112, 162, 163
- iudex/iudices* (governor), 20, 235–6
- Januarianus, Caelius (legate), 98
- Jerusalem, 262
- Jovian (emperor), 253
- Julian
- and Constantinople, 328–32
 - critique of Constantius' sojourn in Antioch, *see* Antioch
 - in Gaul, 285–7
 - Misopogon*, *see* *Misopogon*
 - panegyrics on Constantius II, 209, 300–1, 305, 307–9
 - and Rome, 291, 309–12
- Julianus (*consularis Bithyniae*), 223, 236, 242, 246, 251
- Julianus (proconsul of Asia), 218, 219
- Julianus, Amnius Anicius (urban prefect), 26, 37, 69–72
- Julius (half-brother of Constantine), 25, 33, 81, 151, 174, 178
- Jupiter, 18
- Justina (wife of Magnentius), 176

Index

- Justinus (proconsul of Constantinople),
140, 218
- Krüger, Paul, 72
- Kuhoff, Wolfgang, 22
- lampros*/λαμπρός, 63
- lamprotatos*/λαμπρότατος, *see*
senatorial rank
- landholding, *see* property (landed)
- Lane Fox, Robin, 112
- Laodicea ad Mare (Syria), 122, 128
- Laodicea on the Lycus (Phrygia), 101
- largitio*, 129
- Latin (language), 50, 59–62, 75, 78–80,
91, 96, 101, 137, 140, 162–3, 181,
190, 216, 227, 250, 252, 256, 264,
266, 276, 286, 329
- Lauricius, Bassidius (*comes et praeses*
Isauriae), 224
- law, *see* legislation
- legislation, 28n61, 28n63, 37, 41n125, 44,
54n26, 55, 55n34, 57, 60, 66, 69–72,
74, 87n6, 90, 95, 97, 108, 111, 121,
123, 141–7, 166, 183, 203, 223,
227–30, 232, 236, 237–44, 246, 250,
256, 277, 282, 293–5, 302, 319, 321,
330, 357–9
- legitimacy (imperial), 27, 33, 113, 120,
147, 149, 153, 156, 157, 164, 171,
196, 267, 271, 275, 281, 284, 308,
313, 314, 319–21, 326, 329
- Leontius, Flavius (*comes Orientis* and
quaestor), 96, 102, 181
- Leontius, Flavius Domitius (praetorian
prefect and urban prefect), 95–6,
99, 110, 123, 179, 196, 286, 289, 295
- Leontius, Flavius Julius (equestrian
governor), 56
- Letoius (*curialis*), 299
- letter (imperial), 41, 78, 79, 88, 191,
197–9, 201–2, 203, 212, 216–17, 229,
237–44, 248–9, 256–8, 264, 265,
269, 272, 280, 320, 330
- Letter to the Provincials* (by
Constantine I), 78
- Libanius (orator), 4, 5, 18–19, 24n43, 47,
59, 64–9, 79n132, 88–90, 97, 105,
111, 115, 122, 123–7, 133–41, 143–7,
156, 178, 181–3, 185, 195, 203n120,
222n40, 223–32, 236, 239, 241–2,
244, 246, 247–50, 252, 256, 270,
270n270, 281n12, 310
- Liber De Caesaribus* (by Aurelius
Victor), 48
- Liber Pontificalis*, 296
- Liberius (bishop), 294–5
- Licinius (emperor), 1, 9, 14, 20, 21,
26–9, 30–4, 36, 41, 45–8, 68, 69,
81, 151, 184, 186, 212, 261, 314,
317, 326
- Life of Alexander* (by Praxagoras), 5,
117n144, 163
- Life of Constantine* (by Praxagoras),
117n144
- Limenius, Ulpius (urban prefect and
praetorian prefect), 99–100, 102,
107–10, 113–15, 133, 134
- Liturgy, *see* municipal council
- Lollianus, Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius
signo Mavortius (praetorian
prefect), 21, 24, 76, 77, 113, 283
- Longinus, Claudius (equestrian
governor), 56
- Lucifer of Cagliari (bishop), 88
- Luke (apostle), 262
- Lupus, Virius (cos. 278), 20, 26
- Lydia (province), 214
- Lyons (Lugdunum), 154
- Macedonia (province), 224, 228, 229–30
- Macrina the Younger (sister of Gregory
of Nyssa), 251
- Madalianus, L. Crepereius, 22, 75, 77
- Maecander (river), 101
- magic, 140, 294n77
- magister equitum*, 110, 133, 182
- magister militum*, 110, 171, 180, 203, 253
- magister officiorum*, 115, 127, 181, 183,
217–18, 282
- magister peditum*, 110, 187, 251, 285
- magistrate, 54, 93, 133, 235, 319
- Magnentius (usurper), 6, 99, 107,
171–80, 182–9, 193–7, 200–13, 217,
221, 229, 266, 278–81, 284, 287–93,
300–12, 313, 320, 323, 326, 328, 331
- Magnus, Flavius (proconsul of Asia),
183–5, 188, 218

Index

- Mamertinus, Claudius (cos. 362), 256, 328–30
- Mamre (Palestina), 75
- Marcellinus (*comes Orientis*), 97, 196
- Marcellinus, Antonius (praetorian prefect), 115
- Marinus (proconsul of Asia), 197–8
- mausoleum, 151, 210, 288n44, 295n84, 306
- of apostle John (Ephesus), 21n32
- of Constans (Milan), 210
- of Constantina (Rome), 295
- of Constantine (Constantinople), 262
- Maxentius (emperor), 28–35, 307
- Maximian (emperor), 34
- Maximus (governor of Galatia), 135
- Maximus Augustus* (titulature), 29, 162
- Maximus, Arrius (*consularis* in Syria), 24
- Maximus, L. Artorius (proconsul of Asia), 20
- medallion, *see* coinage
- Megara (Greece), 31
- Melania the Elder, 115
- memory, *see* commemoration
- Menander (senator from Corinth), 115
- Mesopotamia* (province), 94, 174
- metropolis, 199, 300
- Miccalus (brother of Olympius), 224n56, 250n171, 251
- Migl, Joachim, 109
- Milan (Mediolanum), 87, 180–1, 210, 217, 234, 252, 282, 285, 294, 296
- Misopogon* (by Julian), 122, 124
- Modestus, Domitius (*comes Orientis* and urban prefect), 220, 331
- Moesia (diocese and province), 30, 68, 228n78
- Monaxius, Fl. Quintilius Eros (equestrian governor), 56n42, 223
- Moncur, David, 267
- Montius, L. Caelius (proconsul of Asia and *quaestor*), 91, 98–9, 102, 181, 183, 194
- municipal council, 61, 68, 69, 133, 134n60, 144, 145, 164, 196, 319, 326
- absenteeism, 144
- boule*, 9, 59, 63, 144
- bouleutai*/βουλευταί (municipal councillors), 218
- bouleuterion*/βουλευτήριον, 64
- (curial) obligations, 137, 226, 240, 241
- curialis/curiales*, 64, 124, 126, 143n113, 144n115, 222, 224n57, 226, 241, 249, 299
- exemption (from curial obligations), 55, 66, 204, 226, 227n73, 249
- liturgy, 24n43, 124, 143, 143n113, 232n99, 241n134
- municipal councillors, 218
- principalis/principales*, 55, 61, 126
- Mursa (Pannonia Inferior), 175–8, 182, 183, 189, 191, 201, 205, 210–13, 279, 305, 309
- Muses (the), 218
- Musonianus, Claudius Strategius (praetorian prefect), 74–5, 105, 111, 136, 185–6, 217, 219, 225, 253, 256, 270
- Musonius (proconsul and *magister officiorum*), 217
- Myra (Lycia), 123n12, 224
- navicularii*, 133
- Nazianzus (Cappadocia), 269, 270
- Nebriidius (*comes Orientis*), 220
- Nepotianus (usurper), 33, 172, 173–4, 208, 279, 280
- Nepotianus, Virius (cos. 336), 32, 152
- Nicaea, 78, 253
- Nicagoras (*curialis* from Athens), 116
- Nicocles (teacher), 137, 231
- Nicomedia, 15, 22, 43, 51–4, 104, 125, 129, 133, 138, 166, 226, 315
- Nisibis, 129, 160
- notarius*/notary, 126, 127n31, 181, 219, 250, 279, 331
- Numidia (province), 31, 94, 98, 98n57, 104
- Nunehius (praetorian prefect), 176n14, 204n126, 279
- nymphaeum, 91, 101, 123
- obelisk, 260, 303, 304n127, 306–8, 311, 312, 330
- Obodianus (*curialis* from Antioch), 124, 241n134
- Oenoanda (Lycia), 147
- Oliver, James, 197

Index

- Olympian Games of Antioch, *see*
Antioch
- Olympias (daughter of Fl. Ablabius), 66
- Olympius (*consularis* of Macedonia),
 230–2, 239, 242, 251
- Olympius, Fl. Nemesius (*praeses*
Lyciae), 224
- Optatianus, *see* *Porfyrius*
- Optatus, Fl. (*patricius* and cos. 334),
 81, 151
- Oratio*, *see* *letter* (imperial)
- oration, 18–19, 28, 59, 64, 78–9, 114–16,
 133, 139, 144, 185, 186, 201, 210,
 217, 221, 244–5, 247–8, 256, 257–8,
 259–62, 263, 265, 269, 272–5, 280–1,
 299–303, 307–9, 328–30
- Orcistus (Galatia), 80
- ordo*, 13, 55, 55n32, 60–1, 96
- Orfitus, Memmius Vitrasius signo
 Honorius (urban prefect), 93, 177,
 229, 279, 282, 288–90, 296–7
- Origo Constantini*, 47, 58–63
- Ostia, 85, 297, 309
- Paideia*, *see* *education*
- Palestine (Palestina), 75, 79, 187,
 218, 219
- Palladius (*magister officiorum*), 181
- Pamphylia (province), 105, 225
- panegyric, 5, 13–14, 29, 37, 58, 88–90, 101,
 111–13, 128, 139, 141, 162–4, 167,
 173, 176, 207–11, 213, 218, 259–64,
 268, 271–5, 280–1, 298–303, 305,
 306–8, 329
- Pannonia, 152, 284
- Paphlagonia, 214, 249n165
- Pater Augustorum*, *see* *Constantine I*
- patres conscripti*, *see* *senate*
- patricius* (title), 80, 151, 181, 253,
 254, 296
- Paul (bishop), 88, 133, 195, 200
- Paul (the ‘Chain’), 279
- Paulinus, Amnius Manius Caesonius
 Nicomachus Anicius iunior *signo*
 Honorius (urban prefect and cos.
 334), 21, 23–5, 32, 41–4, 62
- Pelagius (*curialis* from Cyrrhus), 299
- perfectissimate rank, *see* *equestrian*
rank
- perfectissimus*, *see* *equestrian rank*
- perfuncti*, *see* *senate*
- Perge, 102, 173, 189–93, 194, 197–9, 202,
 212, 217, 256
- Persia(n empire), 79n133, 88, 89, 103,
 104, 105, 112, 121, 127, 162, 181,
 185, 305
- Peter and Paul (apostles), 262
- Phasganius (uncle of Libanius), 124
- Philagrius, Fl. (*vicarius Ponticae*), 103,
 139n98
- Philippus, Flavius (cos. 408), 253
- Philippus, Flavius (praetorian prefect),
 105, 111, 136, 141, 145, 172,
 189–207, 212, 217, 225, 247–9, 252,
 260, 320
- philosophy, 137, 139, 244, 249,
 263–7, 269
- Phoenicia (province), 22, 67, 76, 96, 97,
 133, 207, 218–19, 331
- Phrygia (province), 22, 183, 184, 214,
 223, 250
- pietas* (piety), *see* *imperial qualities*
- Pietri, Charles, 155
- Pindar, 186
- Pisidia (province), 101
- Placidus, M. Maecius Memmius Furius
 Baburius Caecilianus (cos. 343), 94,
 102, 107, 113, 122, 163
- Polemius, Flavius, 111–13, 117, 122,
 162–4
- pontifex dei Solis*, *see* *religion*
- pontifex Flavialis*, *see* *religion*
- pontifex maximus*, *see* *religion*
- Pontus (province), 22, 56, 77, 133, 186,
 187, 217, 219, 226, 251
- Porfyrius, Publius Optatianus, 13, 16,
 23–5, 36–7, 41
- praefectus annonae*, 309
- praeses* (governorship), 20, 22, 26, 30,
 56, 97, 104, 105, 132, 185, 202, 223,
 224, 225, 240
- praetor Constantinianus*, *see* *senate*
- praetorian prefect, 2n5, 20–2, 32n82,
 39, 48, 65–9, 74n110, 92, 94, 95–6,
 99, 100, 102–3, 106, 107–10, 111,
 113–17, 122, 123, 126–7, 136, 141,
 150, 152, 163, 171, 172, 174, 179,
 182, 185, 186, 189–207, 212, 214,

Index

- 217, 218, 219, 225, 229, 236, 238,
241–2, 246, 248, 253, 256, 260, 270,
275, 279, 282, 283, 286, 310, 314,
318, 320, 321, 322
- praetorship, *see* senate
- Praxagoras (historian), 5, 117n144, 163
- prefect of Egypt, 103, 135n72
- priesthood, *see* religion
- princeps senatus*, *see* senate
- principalis/principales*, *see* municipal
council
- Prisca (daughter of praetorian prefect
Helpidius), 251
- Priscianus (*consularis Euphratensis*), 223
- Proba, Faltonia Betitia (poetess and wife
of Adelphius Celsinus), 99, 177
- Probianus, Petronius (cos. 322), 26, 71
- processus (consularis)*, *see* senate
- proconsul, 136, 167, 220, 225, 238, 239,
243, 249, 256, 270, 321
- of Achaëa, 24, 31, 37, 93, 100–1, 114,
116, 127, 135, 186–7, 217–19,
314, 320
- of Africa, 22, 60, 76, 282
- of Asia, 20–2, 24, 42, 44, 74, 75, 91,
98–9, 107, 171, 181, 183–5, 197–8,
219, 247, 283, 314, 332
- of Constantinople, 9, 99–100, 114,
119, 121, 131–4, 139–40, 185–6, 187,
195, 218, 219, 234, 251, 274, 319
- Procopius (*magister militum* in 424), 253
- Procopius (usurper), 328n18
- Proculus, L. Aradius Valerius signo
Populonium (cos. 340 and urban
prefect), 41–4, 54, 75–7, 94, 107,
177, 184
- Proculus, L. Aradius Valerius signo
Populonium (cos. 348), 22, 23–6, 278
- professio*, *see* senate
- Prohaeresius (orator), 103, 115–16
- property (landed), 28n63, 32, 33, 71n91,
93, 98n57, 103n80, 111, 115, 125,
134, 136, 152, 166, 207, 248, 250,
251, 279, 280, 282, 293, 309
- Propontis, 261
- prostasia*, 124
- protector domesticus*, 182, 203
- proximus libellorum* 251
- Prusa (Bithynia), 138
- quadriga, 148–50, 153–5
- quaestor sacri palatii*, 96, 181, 183, 184,
220, 253, 254, 296
- quaestorship, *see* senate
- quindecennalia*, *see* anniversary (imperial)
- Ravenna, 109
- religion
- Altar of Victory, 293, 295
- bishop, 75, 78, 87–90, 87n5, 105,
132, 179, 195, 199, 200, 201, 209,
227n73, 262, 284, 294–5, 315
- divination, 277, 293–5
- Eleusian Mysteries, 116
- Hispellum (cult at), 25
- imperial cult, 25, 26, 79, 147n122
- pontifex dei Solis*, 25, 283, 297
- pontifex Flavialis* (imperial cult), 25
- pontifex maximus*, 292
- pontifex/priesthood*, 23–6, 93, 292,
297, 309
- sacrifice, 18, 293–5, 297
- temple, 75n112, 272, 290, 292–4,
297, 307
- XVvir sacris faciundis*, 93, 297, 310
- Res Gestae* (by Ammianus Marcellinus),
4n10, 305
- Res gestae Alexandri Macedonis* (by
Polemios), 163
- Rhodope (province), 132, 214
- riot, 19, 133, 138, 140
- Roma* (Tyche), 5, 119
- Rome
- Altar of Victory, *see* religion
- Arch of Constantine, 18n20, 29, 304
- baths, 35
- Capitol, 18, 289
- circus at imperial residence, 35
- Circus Maximus, 289, 295, 303, 305
- Constantine I in, *see* Constantine I
(emperor)
- Constantius II in, *see* Constantius II
(emperor)
- entertainments, 35, 290
- Forum of Trajan, 41, 42, 286n37, 290,
306, 311
- Forum Romanum, 44, 288, 304
- games, 16, 35, 35n101, 38, 69–72,
227–30, 284, 289, 291

Index

- Rome (*cont.*)
 imperial palace on the Lateran, 34
 Santa Costanza (mausoleum),
 288n44, 295
 senate house, *see* senate
 Sessorian Palace, 35
- Rufinus, Aradius (cos. 311), 26
- Rufinus, Vulcacius (praetorian prefect and
 cos. 347), 94, 102, 107, 109, 112, 113,
 122, 163, 174–5, 178–80, 204, 283
- Sabinus (*consularis Syriae*), 226
 sacrifice, *see* religion
- Sagalassus, 90, 91
- Sallustius, Flavius (general and cos.
 344), 111
- Salway, Benet, 110
- Salzman Michele, 284
- Sardis, 18, 32
- sceptre, 16, 17, 119, 130, 281, 285, 303
- Schlange-Schöningen, Heinrich, 138
- Scylacius (proconsul of Achaëa),
 100–1, 114
- Scythia (province), 30
- Sebastos* (imperial titulature), 79–81
- Seeck, Otto, 71
- Seleucia (Syria), 122, 128
- senate
 absenteeism, 38, 144, 227–30, 242, 282
 adlection, 216–17, 222, 236–7, 244–5,
 248–9, 255–7, 258, 267–71
album, 226, 271n272
auctoritas, 28, 38, 324
bouleuterion/βουλευτήριον, 64
consuales, 40, 222, 229, 236, 282
 citizen(ship) (of Constantinople), 195,
 249, 269
 Conscript Fathers (*patres conscripti*),
 62, 190, 191n84, 212, 216, 238,
 256, 320
 of Constantinople, 1–10, 47–72, 141–7,
 189–213, 214–76
cursus honorum, 220, 239, 317,
 321, 326
defensores, 250
dokimasia, 222
 exemptions, 38, 143, 222, 230–2,
 234n104, 235–7, 239, 241, 242, 330
 factions (senatorial), 185, 271, 295
foliis (tax), 40, 223, 231, 236, 241,
 242, 250
munus (obligation), 239
 nomination to the praetorship,
 237–44, 268
perfuncti, 226, 236, 239
pignora, 236
praetor Constantianus, 34, 69–72
 praetorship, 37–9, 59, 121, 141–7, 167,
 192, 215, 222, 223, 232, 234–46,
 235n110, 255, 275, 280, 357–9
princeps senatus, 310
processus (*consularis*), 128–9, 130, 329
professio, 282
 quaestor(ship), 37–9, 219n30, 232n99,
 235n110, 240–1, 255, 317
 of Rome, 1–10, 13–44, 107–17, 177–8,
 221–33, 255–9, 271–2
 senate house (of Constantinople),
 258, 262–3, 273
 senate house (of Rome), 16, 28, 228,
 289, 292, 293, 295, 299, 304
 suffect consul, 2, 23, 29n70, 219n30,
 240n132, 255, 317
synedrion, 9, 58, 64
 Triumphal praetorship, 143, 146, 358
Victoria Senati, 16
- senate house, *see* senate
- senatorial rank
 acquisition of, 221–7
clarissimus (*vir*), 49, 62, 97n52, 98,
 199, 224, 228, 238, 240, 249
 and comitival honours, 73–7
 and landed wealth, 248–55
 loss of, 240
 obligations attached to, 227–33, 234–46
 and officeholding, 13–44, 91–113,
 180–9, 216–27, 248–55
 and the praetorship, 234–46
 Roman honour, 258
 λαμπρότατος, 199n106, 216n9, 224
- senatus*
 in coinage, 16, 18, 5154f2.1
 in legal and literary sources, 60–2,
 243, 357
- separation
 of empire, 86–91, 326
 of senatorial realms, 9, 216–33, 325
- Septimius Severus (emperor), 33

Index

- Severus, Acilius, 74
Severus, Julius (urban prefect), 71, 74
Shapur II, 127, 128–9, 160, 211
Sicily, 23, 32, 75, 76, 298n101
Side, 105, 123n12
siliqua, *see* coinage
Silvanus (usurper), 201, 203, 207–8, 283, 285
Simplicius (son of Fl. Philippus), 252
Sirmium, 30, 97, 174–9, 201, 204, 238
Siscia, 161
Skinner, Alexander, 46, 78, 144
Sozomen (Church historian), 58
Spain, 74, 87, 92, 143n113, 178, 187
Sparta, 55n32, 218
speech, *see* oration
statue
 bronze, 95, 96, 116
 gold, 29, 42, 190, 193, 197–207, 286n37, 311
 silver, 29
statue (honorary), 29, 38, 39–43, 44, 62, 85, 90, 95–6, 102, 105, 115, 116, 155, 172, 183, 189–207, 213, 218, 224, 260, 272, 273, 289–91, 293, 304, 306, 309, 320
strategos (of Athens), 116
student, *see* education
succession (imperial), 33, 148–60, 306
suffect consul, *see* senate
Swift, Louis, 197
Symmachus, Aurelius Avianus
 Phosphorius (*praefectus annonae* and *princeps senatus*), 85–6, 91, 93, 290, 309–11
Symmachus, Aurelius Valerius Tullianus (urban prefect), 30, 37, 85, 93, 240, 290, 292, 297
Symmachus, Q. Aurelius Eusebius (proconsul of Achaëa), 30
symposion, 265
synedrión, *see* senate
Syria (Coele), 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 67, 76, 103, 104, 113, 121–8, 133, 182, 188, 221, 224, 226, 252, 254, 314, 317
Syriarchy, 124
Tarsus, 126, 242, 251
Tatianus, Antonius (senator), 224
Taurus, Flavius (comes and praetorian prefect), 127, 145, 220, 286
Taurus, Flavius (cos. 428), 254
teacher, *see* education
temple, *see* religion
Tertullus (urban prefect), 294, 297
Tetrarchy (of Diocletian), 2, 18n17, 20, 56, 79, 180
Thalassius (praetorian prefect), 127, 179, 182–3, 196, 203, 205, 251–3
Thalassius (senator-to-be), 221–3, 247
Thalassius (son), 251–2
theatre, 13, 123, 202, 218, 260, 263
Thebais, 185
Thebes, 260, 307
Themistius (philosopher), 134n64, 137, 138, 139, 140, 185, 205, 207–11, 216, 221–2, 230–3, 236, 239, 240–5, 248–9, 256–75, 299–303, 305, 306–8
Themistocles (philosopher), 139, 265
Theodorus (*consularis* of Syria Coele), 104, 106
Theodorus, Flavius Antonius (equestrian governor), 103
Theodosia (cousin of Gregory Nazianzus), 269
Theodosius I (emperor), 294, 304n128, 305
Theophilus, F. Anthemius Isidorus (cos. 436), 253
thesaurus (imperial), 129
Thessalonica, 17, 53–4, 217
Thrace, 22, 23, 24, 54, 75, 87, 89, 119n1, 132, 152, 184, 219, 224, 228n78, 233n102, 314, 332
throne (seat), 126, 258, 303
Tiber (river), 261, 300
Tiberianus, Annius (*comes Africae* and *vicarius* in Spain), 74
Tiberianus, Junius (urban prefect), 20
Tibur (city in Italy), 61
Timgad, 55
Timothy (apostle), 262
Titianus, Fabius (cos. 337 and praetorian prefect), 21, 75, 107, 113, 171, 278–9, 310
toga, 16, 93, 206, 257
Toulouse (Tolosa), 151
Tralles (Caria), 183

Index

- trial (treason), 105, 174, 181, 203, 204, 252, 279, 331
- tribunus* (army), 187
- tricennalia*, *see* anniversary (imperial)
- Trier, 16n9, 17, 29, 30, 35n98, 116, 154
- Tuscia (et Umbria, province), 93
- Tychamenes (architect), 65, 66, 68, 247
- tyrant (*tyrannus*), 284, 301, 304, 306, 307, 323
- Tyre (Phoenicia), 182, 251
- Umbria (Tuscia et, province), 93
- urban council, *see* municipal council
- urban prefect(ure), 39–40
- Constantinople, 9, 214, 219, 242, 245–6, 256, 275, 322
- Rome, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 37, 41, 62, 69–72, 74, 76, 86, 93, 96, 98–9, 103, 106, 107–10, 114, 127, 177, 179, 187, 214, 223, 229, 252, 278, 280, 282, 283, 286, 288, 293, 294, 296–8, 310
- Ursinicius (general), 180
- usurpation, 4n10, 171–213, 274, 278, 303–9, 313, 321, 328, *see also* tyrant (*tyrannus*)
- Verinus, Locrius (urban prefect), 20, 26–7
- Vetiana (daughter of Araxius), 187, 251
- Vetranio (general), 172, 174–5, 179, 185, 194, 204n124, 208–12, 301
- Via Flaminia, 288
- vicarius*, 68, 72, 95, 220, 238–9, 250
- of Asiana, 101, 114, 183–4
- ex vicarius*, 238–9
- of Pontica, 104, 187, 219
- in Spain, 74, 92
- of Thrace, 219, 332
- vicarius Italiae*, 68
- vicarius Pietatis*, 226
- vicarius urbicarius*, 39
- vicarius urbis Romae*, 310
- vicennalia*, *see* anniversary (imperial)
- Victoria Senati*, *see* senate
- Victorinianus, Valerius (equestrian governor), 56
- villa, *see* house
- Vita Constantini* (by Eusebius of Caesarea), 5, 46, 48–51, 74, 157, 315
- Volusianus, Ceionius Rufius Lampadius (praetorian prefect), 204, 282–4
- vota*, *see* anniversary (imperial)
- Wienand, Johannes, 160
- Woods, David, 110
- XVvir sacris faciundis*, *see* religion
- Zenophilus, Domitius (cos. 333), 21, 31
- Zeus, 273
- Zosimus (historian), 4n10, 18–19, 31n78, 48, 58n45, 152n139, 201, 210, 261, 330